

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11275

industry is to furnish its proper share of these needs, prompt action is necessary and I join with my colleagues in urging that proper and prompt action be taken by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I take second place to no man in my admiration of the excellent judgment, sound leadership, and expert knowledge of American housing needs and programs possessed by the Senator from Alabama.

When he speaks as he has today, he does it with good reason and logic. I agree with him and I am amazed at the facts he has laid before us.

Improved housing for all citizens, as he has told us, has been a consistent policy of the Senate and of the House for many, many years. But apparently, we have a department of Government, reluctant to support the intent of the Congress.

I have confidence in Secretary Trowbridge, and though he is new in his present responsibilities, I hope that he will reject the advisory panel's recommendations.

Certainly, on the evidence the distinguished Senator from Alabama has given us, the existing lumber standard should be withdrawn and the industry permitted to go ahead with its new and improved product. This would be a true public service.

I hope the Secretary will permit the industry to do the job it is trying to accomplish.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it has long been recognized that the present lumber standards are technically inadequate and not in the public interest. As early as 1957 the southern pine industry petitioned the American Lumber Standards Committee to revise the standards to relate lumber sizes to a specific moisture content. In 1964, after several years of careful study, the committee recommended to the Department of Commerce a set of standards endorsed by the major part of the lumber industry and many interested Government agencies. Still, we are operating under standards developed in 1925, which have become totally unrealistic because of changing practices in the industry.

These outdated standards are an inconvenience to the industry and unfair to the consumer. Only a small minority of green lumber producers derive any benefit from the present standards. The standards now in effect are intended for dry lumber but are not related to any specific moisture content. Since lumber shrinks as it is seasoned, however, standards which do not take into account the moisture content are really no standards at all.

This was no problem before World War II, because green lumber was surfaced to a larger size than dry lumber to compensate for shrinkage. Since the war, however, green lumber producers have been finishing their product to the same size as dry lumber and the shrinkage has been passed on to the consumer.

The purpose and effect of the revised standards proposed by the American Lumber Standards Committee is to establish uniform standards upon which the consumer and the industry can rely.

The Secretary of Commerce has the responsibility and authority to withdraw the present inadequate standards without further legislative action. I strongly urge him to assume that responsibility and exercise his authority promptly in order that revised standards, which will protect the public and promote the continued development of the industry, may be adopted without further delay.

John F. Kennedy
IT IS HIGH TIME THE UNITED STATES TOOK A CLEAR STAND FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the swift and decisive victory of Israel forces over the Arab armies, a number of facts have become crystal clear which had previously been obscured by the rhetoric of the Arab governments, by the material support provided by the Soviet Union to the Arab military forces, and by the confusing and uncertain policies of the United States. It is imperative that these facts not be swept under the rug and forgotten in the feeling of relief that now exists because the shooting has ceased. Such feeling is entirely understandable in the light of the serious situation which would have confronted the United States had the roles of victor and vanquished been reversed and if the Arab armies now occupied Israel, and Soviet Russia in consequence would have dominated the Middle East.

Nevertheless, if a start is to be made in establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East, a frank appraisal of the underlying causes of the conflict is essential. Unless we face up to these factors, we must anticipate resumption of hostilities, with all the dangers that would entail for the world, in the next 5 or 10 years, or even sooner.

The roots of the conflict can be found, in my opinion, in the unrelenting hostility of the Arab countries to the very existence of Israel and in their illusion that Israel can be destroyed by force of arms; in the Soviet Union's support of such illusion and its attempt to use the Middle East as a pawn in its cold war tactics; and in the mistaken policy of the United States that economic and military assistance to the Arab nations would somehow divert these countries from aggression. If these issues were not clear to the American people before, even though some of us in the Congress have over the years been pointing out the dangers of U.S. Middle East policies, it must be abundantly evident now that to return to the conditions and policies of our Government prior to May 1967 can only bring about renewed conflict. Because of this, I would like to discuss today in some detail the root causes of the conflict as I see them and to suggest some possible alternative courses by our Government.

Arab opposition to the very existence of Israel and its view that the United States is the principal culprit responsible for Israel's continued existence have been expressed in such hyperbole and invective that we have been inclined to discount such statements as expression of policy. But recent events have shown

that we cannot dismiss these statements so lightly or attribute them to domestic propaganda efforts at bolstering the flagging morale of peoples for whom the promises of a better life have not borne fruit—largely through their own shortcomings and the ineptness of their leaders—and who now must be sustained by the ideas of a mystic "Arab unity" and the recapture of territory which they never rightfully possessed. It is now evident that statements of Radio Cairo and of the Arab governments, as irrational as they sound to our ears, are indeed expressions of policy. We must now recognize that when the Arab leaders proclaimed toward the end of May 1967, that "we feel confident that we can win and are ready now for a war with Israel," and that if war came "it will be total and the objective will be to destroy Israel," they had every intention to carry these threats into action. Indeed, their secret orders provided for the slaughter of every Israeli—man, woman, and child.

Events have proved that the Arabs meant what they said and indeed provided us with a detailed blueprint of their aggressive intentions as witness the following excerpt from a broadcast of Radio Cairo on May 20, 1967:

With the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel is faced with two alternatives, either of which will destroy it: it will either be strangled to death by the Arab military and economic blockade, or it will perish by the fire of the Arab forces encompassing it from the south, from the north and from the east.

It is now evident that the statements of King Hussein of Jordan regarding his solidarity with the Arab cause, which the United States tended to discount since it conflicted with its picture of a plucky little ruler strongly aligned with us by the massive economic and military aid the United States had furnished him, provided a precise account of the course of action Jordan would follow.

On June 2, 1967, King Hussein said:

There is no doubt that I am looking forward to further frank cooperation with Egypt and the other Arab States both to the east and to the west, so that we may march forward along the road which leads to the wiping out of our shame and to the liberation of Palestine. This is a basic cornerstone of Jordan's general policy, both within the realm of Arab affairs, as well as in the spheres of internal and foreign policies.

That "plucky little ruler" then proceeded to initiate hostilities against the Israelis, employing the tanks, aircraft, and other weapons the United States furnished him to carry out plans which had previously been made in coordination with the Egyptians, placed his forces under the Egyptian command, and opened his country to Iraqi forces which began to move several hundred tanks into the Jordanian salient 15 miles from Tel Aviv.

This action by King Hussein came after a plea to him by Israel not to attack accompanied by Israel's pledge that if he did not, there would be no Israeli invasion of the territory then held by him.

It is time that the United States took a good, hard look at the statements coming out of the Arab countries and begin to recognize that no matter how illusionary and irrational they may seem to

S11276

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1967

us, they represent the hard convictions of the Arab rulers. Unless we do this, we will continue to base our policies and actions on the fanciful notions of what we would like the intention of the Arab governments to be rather than on what is actually planned.

Statements emanating from the Arab countries in recent weeks show not the slightest realization of the magnitude of their military defeat, of the loss of sizeable territories to the Israelis, and of the resultant precarious economic situation which their aggression brought upon them. For Egypt it has meant the loss of the Suez Canal revenues. To put it briefly, their view is one of unrelenting hostility both to the United States and to Israel stated in abusive and often violent language. The United States is the arch villain, an imperialist, colonial power and Israel is its tool of aggression. Here are some samples:

On July 19, 1967, the Cairo Voice of the Arabs stated:

It appears that the outcome of the recent tripartite aggression masterminded by the United States has enthralled the Israeli gangs and driven them into a euphoria of self-delusion and arrogance, whereby they are now brazenly aspiring to realize dreams and ambitions that will never be attained . . . Israel, the dog of imperialism and the panderer to the world imperialist forces, is today contemplating and dreaming of passage through the Suez Canal . . . This Zionist attempt enjoys the encouragement and support of the imperialist forces. No evidence of this could be more eloquent than the United States' insistence upon making the withdrawal of the aggressor forces contingent upon the fulfillment of the conditions contemplated by the United States, which are of course in favor of the Israeli aggression against the Arabs—such as free passage for Israel in the areas' waterways . . .

Lest these words again be dismissed as domestic propaganda, here is an excerpt from the July 23, 1967, statement of Egyptian President Nasser, which, unbelievably, has been greeted as a temperate and reasonable address by some newspapers in this country:

A large part of the U.S. role in the recent aggression is still vague. But we already know a few things. We have already found the answers to several questions. What was behind the political and diplomatic role which the United States played before the battle? This role included the call for self-restraint, the threat that any action taken by us would expose the entire region to dangers, the proposal to send the U.S. vice president to confer with us on the subject, the approval of Zakariya Muhyl ad Din's trip to Washington to meet with Johnson to confer on the subject and to try and reach a solution. All this took place before the aggression, before the battle.

It was a deception. We must ask: In whose interest was this deception? Certainly it was in the interest of the imperialist Israeli aggression. The deception was part of a U.S. plan drawn up two years ago. The aim of this plan was to overthrow the free revolutionary regimes, which do not heed the words of the big powers and refuse to be under anyone's influence.

The New York Times, in a recent editorial appropriately entitled "Fantasy From Nasser" charges that in accusing the United States of an imperialist conspiracy to destroy Egypt's Socialist revolution, Egypt is guilty of fantasy. The editorial goes on to say that:

In spite of his impulsive seizure of Suez, his irresponsible campaign in Yemen and other forays into international politics, many informed observers have been inclined in the past to minimize the Egyptian leader's excesses, citing his relative caution in comparison to other more volatile Arab leaders and pointing to many reasonable and concrete steps he has taken to try to rebuild Egypt's impoverished and demoralized feudal society. Today, however, it must be sadly noted that President Nasser has apparently thrown caution and reason to the desert winds. In calling on Egyptians once more to mobilize their meager resources for continuing warfare against an Israel he refused to recognize after a third, shattering Egyptian defeat by Israeli armed forces, Nasser has betrayed his promise of a better life for the Egyptian people. He has shown himself to be a prisoner of the extreme Arab emotions he once sought to master.

Other Arab governments are equally adamant in their views that there can be no peaceful settlement with Israel and that the only course of action for them is to continue to seek the destruction of Israel. With their armies and air forces smashed, with their economies on the verge of bankruptcy, it would seem to be the height of folly for the Arabs to pursue the same disastrous course. But recent utterances from the Arab capitals give no indication that these countries are any more reconciled to the existence of Israel in the aftermath of their military defeat. James A. Michener, writing in the August 8, 1966, issue of *Look* magazine, described the extent of the Arab resolve to continue hostilities against Israel:

On the night when the defeat of the Arab armies was known to the world as one of the most crushing in history, I discussed matters on an all-night radio show with Dr. M. T. Mehdi, secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations and he said: these points: "Nothing has changed. Israel is worse than Nazi Germany, and the Arabs will have to drive her from the region. The war will continue precisely as it has been going for the past 19 years. And what the Americans and the English took away from the Arabs by their intervention, the Arabs will recover at the conference table. Peace talks of course will have to be conducted through third parties at the United Nations, because no Arab leader will ever agree to sit down and talk with an outlaw nation like Israel. You'll see. The United Nations will force Israel back to her 1948 boundaries, after which all Arab nations will unite in a war to exterminate her, because this is going to be just like the Crusades. For two hundred years, the Arabs will continue their fight and in the end they'll do exactly what they've said. Push Israel into the sea."

Lest any Arab leader be tempted to seek an accommodation with Israel, Radio Cairo issued this warning on July 17, 1967:

What is going on all over the homeland proves to America and even to its agents that the Arab masses will never let any responsible Arab person remain alive who would dare to negotiate with Israel. Events throughout the homeland prove that the people are determined that struggle and fighting are the only way to confront the enemies and regain the stolen territory. That is why the great popular reaction to the Suez clashes yesterday is an affirmation of the Arab's determination to take a stand and to be willing to sacrifice themselves in battle.

In a perceptive article in the July 26, 1967, issue of the *Washington News*,

Scripps-Howard writer Robert Dietsch gives us an account of the rampant war spirit he found in Iraq when he was the first American to visit that country after the war:

In the past seven weeks, Iraq has aligned itself with Arab extremists in Cairo and Damascus who demand continued aggression against Israel, a continued oil boycott against the U.S., Britain and West Germany, and wider boycotts against Western firms.

Indeed some sources say Iraq is the loudest voice of all the Arab nations demanding stricter boycotts. Baghdad is flirting openly with Moscow and Peking talking arms and trade.

The Soviet Union's support of Arab aggression is nothing new. In the weeks before open hostilities broke out the Soviet Union had circulated the baseless rumor that there was an Israeli plan to invade Syria; the Soviets had supported the Egyptian closing of the Strait of Tiran; it had stepped up arms shipment; and had declared itself in full support of the Arabs.

Without massive deliveries of arms and munitions from the Soviet Union, the Arab countries would never have been in a position to carry on their aggressive acts against Israel. By 1967 Russia had completed deliveries of 1,800 tanks to Egypt and Syria and over 500 fighter and bomber aircraft. Other deliveries included 500 armored carriers, 24 missile-carrying torpedo boats, 50 helicopters, and 66 transport planes. The vast quantities of Soviet military supplies furnished Egypt have been comprehended only recently when the Israel Government permitted American newspapermen and television reporters to examine and televise the vast hoard of captured Soviet equipment at El Arish and other locations in the Sinai.

Authoritative estimates have placed the value of such military supplies at \$2 billion. These amounts are in addition to massive arms shipments by the Soviets to Iraq and Algeria.

Indeed, it is likely that the recent Middle East conflict was triggered in the first instance by the Soviet Union when it informed the Egyptians that Israel was massing troops—an unfounded allegation. Here is President Nasser's account of the matter:

The first thing that should be clear to us all is that we were not the ones who started the crisis in the Middle East. We all know that this crisis began with Israel's attempt to invade Syria. It is quite clear to all of us that in that attempt Israel was not working for itself alone, but also for the forces which had gotten fed up with the Arab revolutionary movement . . . Our parliamentary delegation headed by Anwar as-Sadat was on a visit to Moscow, and our Soviet friends Anwar as-Sadat at that time that the invasion of Syria was imminent . . . What were we to do? We could have remained silent, we could have waited, or we could have just issued statements and cables of support. But if this homeland had accepted such behavior it would have meant that it was deserting its mission, its role and even its personality . . . therefore it was imperative that we take concrete steps to face the danger threatening Syria . . .

Egypt's request for the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Sinai and the blockade of Israel shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba followed.

Since the Arab military debacle, the Soviet Union has taken on the respon-

sibility of reequipping the defeated Arab armies. Reports from the Middle East indicate that to date at least half of the destroyed Egyptian aircraft have now been replaced by the Soviet Union and about one-fourth of the tanks. In addition it appears likely that with the loss of Suez Canal revenues, Egypt will become entirely dependent on the Soviet Union for food assistance. Whether the Soviet Union will want to bear the massive cost of economic and military assistance to the Arab countries for the indefinite future in the light of other strategic interests, is a major question. Suffice it that Russia's attempt to penetrate the Middle East through the military and political support of the Arab countries has been dealt such a severe blow as to cause Russia to reassess the cost of its support against any possible gains.

However, if Soviet policy in the Middle East has proved to be misguided, the same can be said of American policy in that area. For 10 years the United States poured billions of dollars of economic and military aid into the Arab countries to maintain a balance of power between Israel and the Arabs, on the assumption that such balance of power would result in a military standoff. This assumption has been proved grossly wrong. The Arab countries were not at all interested in a standoff and used our aid to launch their aggression against Israel. Jordanian officers, trained in the United States at U.S. expense and whose very salaries were paid for by budget support funds provided to the Jordanian Government, led an army largely equipped with American arms and supplies in an aggressive and unprovoked attack against Israel.

From 1960 through 1966 the United States gave Egypt almost \$1 billion in foodstuff. Nasser used this massive economic assistance to conserve his foreign exchange which he would otherwise have had to spend on purchases of agricultural commodities and then squandered it on adventures in Yemen, the Congo and on huge arms purchases from the Soviets.

During these years the United Arab Republic violated agreement after agreement with the United States. Yet so committed was our State Department to a policy of currying favor with Nasser through ever larger gifts of economic assistance, that each violation was forgiven and the circumstances of the violations hidden from the American people by placing security classifications on these matters.

American policy in the Middle East has been unsuccessful. It did not secure peace and stability, made no headway in reconciling the Arab States to the existence of Israel, did not keep the Soviet Union from extending its influence throughout the area, and it did not prevent the complete alienation of the Arab governments, which now, with magnificent self-deception, view the United States as the principal architect of their military defeat.

If the Arabs were frustrated in their 19-year-long attempts to "push Israel into the sea," and if the Soviet Union's desire to become the dominant force in the Middle East have been thwarted, it cannot be attributed to U.S. Middle East policy. Arab aggression was defeated, So-

viet penetration of the area held in check, and vital American-European interests protected only because the Israelis, with their very existence at stake, despairing of waiting for the United States to live up to its commitments to break the blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba took the defense of their survival into their own hands.

We have been hearing a lot about "our commitments" in the last few years. Military aid has continued to flow to France and other Western European countries, long after the Congress had been told that the aid programs had come to an end, allegedly because of the necessity to "fulfill previous commitments."

Economic assistance has gone to countries long past the need for such assistance because of "previous commitments." And most importantly, our disastrous involvement in the Vietnam fiasco has been justified on the dubious grounds of alleged commitments to a South Vietnamese Government long since deposed, commitments which were created through executive action by an administration determined on a course of military involvement on the mainland of Asia.

Yet when the time came for the United States to face up to its very real commitments to Israel, in an area of the world where, unlike Southeast Asia, its vital interests were very much involved, it vacillated.

Among the most obvious reasons for U.S. support of Israel are that that little country comes closest of all the 70 nations born in the wake of the anticolonial revolution of the past two decades, to carrying out in its actions, the principles, policies and ideals which the American people profess. It is a democracy with all the freedoms. It exemplifies "government by consent of the governed." It is an oasis of liberty and responsibility in a desert of dictatorship and backwardness. No other new nation has so striking a record of achievement, the more notable because accomplished in the face of harassment by neighbors 50 times more numerous and occupying an area 1,000 times as great. On top of all this, Israel has sent technical aid to some less developed countries. Its brilliant military victory against incredible odds is but a further demonstration of the intrinsic worth of that nation and its people. If there is one new nation in the world that merits U.S. support it is Israel.

Instead of forthright support for Israel and a joint effort to break the blockade in the Strait of Tiran, the United States equivocated. The Israel Government was faced with mounting evidence of Arab intention to launch an attack against its country and realized that, with each day that passed while it waited for the United States to act, Arab strength increased. Finally Israel launched its own military defense.

Randolph and Winston Churchill, the son and grandson of the late Sir Winston Churchill, have given a vivid account of this period in their book "The 6-Day War," excerpts from which appeared in the July 30, 1967, issue of the Washington Post:

On May 22, the crisis entered a new stage when Egypt declared the Strait of Tiran closed to Israeli ships and to all strategic materials being shipped to Israel on board

non-Israeli vessels. President Nasser declared: "If Israel threatens us with war, we will reply thus: Go ahead, then".

On May 24, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban left for Washington, via Paris and London, to see President Johnson and later to address the United Nations Security Council.

On May 26, after keeping Eban waiting for most of the day, Mr. Johnson called him in for a talk. The President was disconcerted when Eban produced a file of documents which the Israelis considered to be evidence of a firm American commitment to uphold the principle of "free and innocent passage" through the Gulf of Aqaba.

Among these papers was the draft of a speech made by his immediate predecessor, Golda Meir, to the United Nations General Assembly on March 1, 1957. This had been prepared jointly by Eban, at that time Israeli Ambassador in Washington, and John Foster Dulles, and amended in Dulles own hand.

Eban also reminded Mr. Johnson during their 85-minute conversation of the President's record on the issue. When Mr. Johnson was Senate Democratic Leader in 1965-6-7, he had been strongly pro-Israel. He had burst into public anger when Dulles threatened Israel with sanctions unless she withdrew from Sharm El-Sheikh.

In his talk with Eban, Mr. Johnson was full of friendly bluster—"I want to see that little blue and white Israeli flag sailing down those straits"—but would make no firm commitment.

On May 30, King Hussein of Jordan unexpectedly arrived in Cairo and, after a stay of only six hours, signed a defense agreement with President Nasser. This surprised the Egyptian people as much as foreigners. The two men had for long been at loggerheads, President Nasser having often denounced Hussein as a traitor to the Arab cause.

The defense pact was undoubtedly the turning point between peace and war. Strategically, an alliance between Egypt and Jordan could scarcely be tolerated by Israel. For Israel would not be exposed to attack at its most vulnerable point, the "soft underbelly" where Jordanian territory forms a salient into Israel and provided a hostile base for attack only 12 miles from the Mediterranean coast.

Thus the talkers were being overtaken by events. While President Johnson and Prime Minister Wilson were hawking a document around the world seeking to obtain the support of other maritime nations for concerted action to pen the Strait of Tiran, the problem had become a minor issue to Israel. The deadly threat of an Arab military buildup along her borders was paramount.

The resounding Israel defeat of Arab armies has had the effect of decreasing the urgency of a reexamination of the U.S. policy in the Middle East and the administration, now that its chestnuts have been pulled out of the fire by the Israelis, appears all too happy to return to its preoccupation with Vietnam. Whatever happened, for example, to the McGeorge Bundy task force on the Middle East and the comprehensive solution of the problems of that area? Big fanfare at the time of its creation; no action since.

It would be most unfortunate if the Israeli military victory were allowed to obscure the shortcomings in the U.S. Middle East policy. One may well be fearful that the administration has not learned the lessons of the past and that whatever new economic and military aid programs that are being considered will repeat discredited formulas. Here is an Assistant Secretary of State testifying

August 10, 1967

before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on June 22, 1967. In answer to Senator SYMINGTON's question as to why we did not permit the Israelis to purchase fighter aircraft from us, Secretary Kitchen responded:

First the overriding consideration was for the United States not to be identified as a heavy or principal supplier to either of the antagonists in a potential conflict.

Second, we wanted to maintain as much suasion as we could in the Arab countries. We felt that would have been decreased if we had become a large single source supplier to Israel.

One may ask, "How much suasion did we have with Nasser after sending him more than a billion dollars in economic assistance?" "How much suasion did our military air program give us in the case of King Hussein of Jordan who used the weapons we had furnished him to make an unprovoked attack on Israel?" "Do the Arab governments now hold us in higher esteem because we were not 'identified as a heavy or principal supplier to either of the antagonists?'"

The first step in the adoption of a realistic Middle East policy by the United States is the recognition that no economic or military aid program to the Arab countries is likely, by itself, to influence any Arab government. Unless we require and secure specific and dependable assurances of their course of action, our aid programs will not divert Arab hostility from Israel and the United States or make these countries more amenable to a peace settlement. If Jordan turns to the United States for assistance to relieve the desperate economic position in which the loss of its west bank has left it, we should accede only when firm agreements have been reached that Jordan is prepared to normalize relations with Israel. There is not too much justification for Jordan's existence except as a possible buffer State. It has failed thus far in that role.

What purpose is served in continuing our food shipments to Algeria and the United Arab Republic in the light of the unabated expressions of hostility toward the United States, some examples of which were cited earlier? Unless we stop considering the Arab countries equally deserving of our assistance as Israel, we invite nothing but a repetition of the events of May 1967.

But if events have proved that our aid programs have given the United States little influence over Arab policy, it has done as little in regard to the Soviet Union. In their mad rush to destroy Israel, and in their accusations of U.S. military intervention on the side of Israel, the Arab countries were quite prepared to see a direct confrontation between the United States and Russia in the Mediterranean with all the dreadful possibilities for nuclear warfare that such confrontation might entail.

The point cannot have been lost on the leaders of the Soviet Union that in providing arms to the Arabs, it may have provided a monster over which it has no control and one which was fully capable of involving it in a nuclear war. Perhaps it was the realization of this capability which led the Soviets to seek a compromise solution in the General Assembly

which coupled a call for withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territory with a call for an end to the state of belligerency between the combatants. Perhaps, too, the same realization will limit the Soviet deliveries of new arms to the Arab countries to such minimum amounts as will avoid any criticism that it is deserting allies. There is little evidence however, that the Soviet Union will change its course.

While it is possible to hope for a change in Soviet policy, and to work for a change in U.S. policy, little can be done at the moment with any possibility of altering Arab intransigence and hostility. As James A. Michener writes in the Look magazine article previously referred to—

Nasser will probably gain more from the Arab world in defeat than he would have gained in victory. The war made him a tragic hero around whom the emotional Arabs can rally. Soon, his new crop of generals will be making the old speeches of 1948, 1956 and 1967. His people will believe them, for fantasy is impossible to eradicate if one's whole society is structured on the perpetuation of the Arab's Night.

On June 27, 1967, I said on the floor of the Senate:

Stability and peace can be assured in the Middle East, but not by acceding to the demands that Israel relinquish the territories she now occupies and which the bitter lesson of recent days shows it must retain at least until adequate and trustworthy arrangements for her security are obtained.

Failing to obtain these, Israel should retain this terrain whose people will in any event be better off than under Arab management—

No pressure from a United Nations General Assembly, which has shown itself incapable and unwilling to establish peace in the Middle East, should be allowed to nullify the consequences of defeat for the Arab world. Nasser and his allies have chosen to find an outlet for their implacable hostility to Israel in a test of military strength. The choice was theirs. They are now tasting the bitter fruits of their frustrated ambitions.

In an excellent article in the July 30, 1967, issue of the Washington Post, Joseph Kraft writes about the difficult economic situation now confronting the Arab countries, the deadlock at the United Nations Assembly which—

... has induced among some American officials a keen disposition to find a way out. Behind the scenes there have been heavy pressures on Israel for one-sided concessions. At one point, the United States very nearly switched its United Nations vote from abstention to aye on a Pakistani resolution which in effect called for unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Jerusalem.

Mr. Kraft argues that—

In this situation, doing nothing can be a paying proposition for the United States. The more time goes by, the more the impasse draws on without an agreement, the more there will be promoted the sense of realities which must precede any settlement.

These views are in accord with the statement I made on June 27, 1967. They deserve reiteration now when new aid programs to the Arab countries may unwittingly be contemplated and pressure may be applied to Israel to withdraw its forces unconditionally from the Sinai, from the west bank of the Jordan and from the Old City of Jerusalem. Israel

should resist these pressures unequivocally and hold fast to its present positions at the very least until there has been a peace settlement between all the parties and Israel's very existence and permanence are adequately guaranteed.

If these guarantees are not forthcoming soon, Israel may well conclude that time has run out, that Arab hostility is implacable and immutable, and decide that the areas acquired as a result of Arab aggression are necessary to Israel's safety and survival. There will be ample justification for such a course.

If the United States is to be consistent with its alleged and long valid position as a defender of freedom and democracy, it should make unequivocally clear in the Middle East that it supports democratic Israel in its aspiration for peace and permanence and the recognition by Israel's neighbors that the nation that is Israel not only exists but is there to stay.

Israel's victory brought to the fore in an urgent manner the problem of the Arab refugees. This problem should have been of urgent import to the nations of the world all during these years while the Arab nations deliberately fanned the fires of hate in hearts of the refugees rather than working diligently at the immense problems of their resettlement and retraining. Actually the Arab nations have deliberately fought against the resettlement of the Arab refugees, preferring to keep them as exhibits for propaganda purposes and as a constant threat on the very borders of Israel. Through the United Nations the United States and other nations have expended millions upon millions of dollars on the maintenance of the refugees while the Arab countries have constantly thrown roadblocks in the way of their rehabilitation.

A realistic resolution of the refugee problem must be an integral part of any peace settlement between Israel and the Arab countries.

However, pending such a peace settlement Israel has a major task in governing the 700,000 refugees within the lands it now occupies since its victory, and in providing for their education, food, shelter, and clothing. If the intransigence of the Arab nations with respect to making peace with Israel continues for any great length of time Israel will also have the task of the settlement of these refugees and of their training so that they may support themselves. In this Israel will need financial help from the free world—and it should receive it in amounts sufficient to enable it to do an excellent job of rehabilitating the Arab refugees.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD James A. Michener's article in Look magazine; an editorial from the New York Times; excerpts from Randolph and Winston Churchill's book "The 6-Day War" covered in the July 30, 1967, issue of the Washington Post; Robert Dietsch's article in the July 26, 1967, Washington Daily News; and the Joseph Kraft article in the July 30, 1967, Washington Post.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

[From Look magazine, Aug. 8, 1967]

ISRAEL: A NATION TOO YOUNG TO DIE
(By James Michener)

I remember when I first became aware of the unnatural tension under which the citizens of Israel have been obliged to live since the establishment of their nation in 1948. I had come to the seaport city of Haifa to do research on a book, and for well over a year, I stayed there, probing the various libraries at my disposal.

Almost every week, and often three or four times a week, my morning paper carried the news that one or another leading Arab politician, and not infrequently a head of state of one of the neighboring Arab countries, had announced his intention of leading an army that would "push the Jews of Israel into the sea," or that would "wipe them off the face of the earth," or perhaps, "strangle them forever." I suppose that the threats occurring during the time I worked in Israel totaled well over a hundred.

They came from more than a half-dozen different countries, some as far away as Algeria and Morocco, whose preoccupation with Israel I could not understand. They did not come, so far as I remember, from Lebanon or Jordan, which have common boundaries with Israel.

Especially appalling to me were the five different times when some Arab head of state announced that he was going to blow up the city in which I sat working. I took even those threats without panic, for I have seen a good deal of war and bombing and do not frighten easily, but I must admit that when the Arab leaders narrowed down their target to the hotel in which I was sitting, and when on two occasions they gave a specific timetable for dispatching their rockets, I felt shivers run up my spine.

I lived for more than a year under these constant threats. I neutralized them by saying, "I'm free to leave Israel when I like. I have no personal attachments and no responsibility." But what must have been the accumulated anxiety for the head of a growing family in Haifa who heard these threats each week, not for one year but for nineteen? What must have been his feelings if he knew that he could not leave the threatened country, that he had a responsibility both to his family and to his nation?

Israel's apprehension was not a paper one. In addition to the threats, there were constant incursions into Israel, constant shootings across the borders, constant intrusions by groups as large as squadrons or small companies. If I went to do some research on the old synagogue at Korazim, I was somewhat taken aback to find that one day later, a pitched battle had been fought there and two Israeli civilians had been killed. If I went on a picnic to the Sea of Galilee, I was a bit shaken when two days later, there was a bombardment of Israeli boats. If I visited the kibbutz at Dam and waded upstream to the cool spring that forms one of the headwaters of the River Jordan, I was frightened to learn that, shortly before, a man had been lost doing that. And when I moved to Jerusalem, to work in the libraries there, I was sorrowful when children told me I must not walk down this alley by the Persian synagogue; gunfire had been coming in from the rooftops only 50 feet away.

And wherever I went, whether to Haifa, or to Korazim, or the Galilee, or Beersheba, there was the constant dinning in my ears of the threat, reiterated week after week, "We are going to destroy you. We are going to push you into the sea." The history of Israel is the history of ordinary people living ordinary lives under the incessant repetition of that threat, backed up by just enough Arab military activity to prove that the threat might be put into action at any moment.

To understand the problem of Israel, the outsider must imagine himself living in

Washington, D.C., and reading each morning that neighbors in Baltimore and Alexandria have again threatened to blow Washington off the face of the earth and to push all Washingtonians into the Potomac. The threat, mind you, does not come from across the Atlantic or Pacific. It comes from a few miles away. And to prove the reality of the threat, actual military adventures occur from time to time, taking the lives of random Washingtonians.

What chance would you say there was for the citizens of Washington to go on indefinitely ignoring such behavior? This article is an account of why the citizens of Israel had to react to such a situation.

I must point out at the beginning that I hold no special brief for either the Israelis or Jews in general. I have lived too long among them to retain any starry-eyed visions. They are ordinary people marred by ordinary weaknesses and bolstered by the courage that ordinary men of all nations and races can at times draw upon. I worked among Muslims for ten years before I ever set foot in Israel, and on at least 50 percent of the characteristics by which men and societies are judged, I like Muslims at least as well as I like the Jews.

Furthermore, I am a professional writer who has worked in many contrasting societies, and I have found none inherently superior to all others. There have been many single aspects of Japan, or Polynesia, or Spain, or India, or Afghanistan that I have preferred, and to me, Israel is merely one more country. It happens to have certain characteristics that elicit enormous respect, but so did each of the Muslim countries in which I worked.

What we are concerned with here is a problem of worldwide significance: How can nations that must live side by side do so with a decent regard one for the other? In trying to reach a solution to this problem, Israel has as many responsibilities as its neighbors. However, this particular inquiry relates primarily to certain adjustments the Arabs must make before any kind of stability can be achieved in a region where stability is much to be desired.

Exactly how vicious were the verbal threats? It will be instructive, I think, to follow the behavior of one Arab country over a short period of time so that the non-Middle Easterner can catch something of the quality of the attacks that were constantly being made. For this purpose, I have chosen Syria, which has a common frontier with Israel and an internal political problem that makes verbal attacks on Israel an attractive form of demagoguery.

For some years, Syria's politics have been unusually volatile. During my stay in the area, there were several revolutions, three complete changes of government and continued violence. At one time, observers had hoped that Syria's political union with Egypt might produce a substantial and stable bloc of Arab power that would carry with it a sense of responsibility. But that union did not last long, and with its dissolution, Syria plunged into contortions that carried it first in one direction, then another. Consequently, Syrian politicians found that the one thing that united them was a common call for violence against Israel. This is how they spoke:

13 March 1966, the official newspaper, *Al Baath*: "It has become evident that our problem will only be solved by an armed struggle to expel the rapacious enemy, and put an end to the Zionist presence."

17 April 1966, the chief of state of the country, Nureddin Al-Attassi, in a speech at a military parade: "A total popular war of liberation is the only way to liberate Palestine and foil the plan of imperialism and reaction. . . . We shall work for the mobilization of all efforts for the needs of the total popular war of liberation."

12 May 1966, the Syrian commander in chief: "As for the statements of the so-called

ministers and officials in Israel that they will punish states which support the commando forces . . . we tell them that we shall wage a liberation war against them as the Party has decided, and fear and alarm will fill every house in Israel."

18 May 1966, Radio Damascus: "When our revolution declared that the way to liberate Palestine is through a popular war, it knew beforehand that the meaning of this declaration is an open and decisive confrontation with Israel."

22 May 1966, Chief of State Al-Attassi: "We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war that will destroy the Zionist base."

24 May 1966, Syrian Defense Minister Hafez Assad: "We say: We shall never call for, nor accept peace. . . . We have resolved to drench this land with our blood, to oust you, aggressors, and throw you into the sea for good."

16 July 1966, Premier Yousef Zouayen: "The popular liberation war which the Palestinian masses, backed by the Arab masses in the whole Arab homeland, have determined to wage, will foil the methods of Israel and those behind it. We say to Israel: Our reply will be harsh and it will pay dearly."

It must be remembered that the above quotations come from a period of relative stability along the Syrian-Israeli frontier. In the succeeding nine months, from September, 1966, through May, 1967, or just before the outbreak of armed hostilities, both the tempo and the inflammability increased. In those weeks when Syria was not threatening to destroy Israel, the heads of other Arab nations were. During my stay in Israel, I believe all the Arab states, excepting Jordan and Lebanon, made specific announcements that they were preparing a war that would drive Israel into the sea.

This constant incendiary barrage came to a climax in May of 1967, when war against Israel had pretty well been agreed upon, and perhaps that accounts for the exaggerated quality of these statements:

25 May 1967, Cairo radio, in a broadcast to all Arab countries: "The Arab people is firmly resolved to wipe Israel off the map."

26 May 1967, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt: "Our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

26 May 1967, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Ahmed Shukairy: "D-day is approaching. The Arabs have waited 19 years for this and will not flinch from the war of liberation."

29 May 1967, the same Mr. Shukairy: "The struggle has begun at the Gulf of Aqaba and will end at the Bay of Acre."

30 May 1967, Cairo radio: "Faced by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel has two choices, both of which are drenched with Israel's blood: Either it will be strangled by the Arab military and economic siege or it will be killed by the bullets of the Arab armies surrounding it from the South, from the North and from the East."

1 June 1967, the commander of the Egyptian Air Force on Egyptian television: "The Egyptian forces spread from Rafah to Sharm el Sheik are ready for the order to begin the struggle to which we have looked forward for so long."

Now, I suppose that a logical man ought to reason: "If the leaders of the Arab states confine their threats to verbalisms, no matter how virulent, the citizens of Israel should adjust to the situation, for obviously the Arabs are using words in a way that need not be taken seriously." Speaking for myself, after my initial weeks of shock, I began to dismiss the blasts against Israel as bombast.

I tried to quiet my inner fears and become adjusted to this incessant barrage of verbal threats, but my ability to live with them did not mean that I was immune to them. Not at all. For whether I liked it or not, I was

S 11280

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1967

living under an act of aggression. That it was psychological rather than physical make it the more insidious. I began to find that, although in public I dismissed the threats as evidences of temporary insanity on the part of those who made them, when I was alone, I had to worry about them. Against my will, I found myself concluding, "If Syria and Egypt and Iraq and the others keep on making such threats, they must in the end do something about them. And if Israelis continue to hear these threats week after week, they must in the end accept them as real, and they, too, will have to act upon them."

In this way, not only were the airwaves polluted, not only was all intercourse between nations contaminated and all chance of peaceful coexistence frustrated, but the psychological processes of both those who made the threats and those who received them were slowly and painfully corroded until both Arab and Jew knew that war was inevitable. On one visit to Jordan, which was one of the least psychotic areas, I talked with 16 young Arabs, and all said they longed for the day when they could march with the Arab armies into Israel and wipe it off the face of the earth. In Egypt, I found attitudes the same. And what was most regrettable, in Israel, where I knew thousands of persons who would speak frankly, a dull kind of resignation possessed them: "I suppose that one of these days we shall have to defend ourselves again."

It is because of the danger that thrives on verbal threats that English common law evolved the concept of assault and battery. Not many laymen appreciate that in law, the threat to do bodily damage is roughly the same as physically doing it. But society has learned that the continued psychological damage to the threatened victim is often graver than an actual punch in the nose might have been. The threat involves uncertainty and accumulating fear, whereas the physical release of an actual blow is over and done with in an instant. Thus, in strict legality, if I hold a gun and threaten, "I am going to shoot you," that is an assault. If I actually do the shooting, it is a battery. The important thing, however, is that the law holds the two things roughly equal, and a private citizen may be as quickly thrown in jail for one as for the other.

When assault is resorted to by nations, it is a violation of the United Nations Charter, Article 2, Principle number 4. Yet for 19 years, Israel lived under constant assaults.

In spite of my knowledge that a verbal assault is sometimes more destructive than a physical battery, in spite of my recognition of Arab behavior as aggression, and in spite of my experience with history that proves one aggression breeds another. I still clung to my hope that as long as the Syrians and the Egyptians confined themselves to wordy abuse, Israel could learn to live with it as one of the peculiarities of Arab politics. I even began to understand why nations as far away as Morocco, Algeria and Pakistan wanted to participate in the verbal campaign, for in this way, they kept their franchise as Muslim states. I was pleased to see that more mature Muslim sovereignties like Turkey, Iran and even Arab Tunisia wanted no part of this folly. Again and again, I told my Israeli friends and others who asked me, "As long as the Arabs confine themselves to verbal threats alone, no great damage will be done."

Unfortunately, the surrounding countries did not confine themselves to verbalisms. They also engaged in open acts of invasion, sabotage, terrorism and military action. I myself witnessed the aftermaths of three such actions.

One day in 1963, I visited the ancient black-basalt synagogue at Korazim because I wanted to see how Jews had worshiped in the time of Christ. It is believed that Jesus

once lectured there, and I found ruins not often visited by tourists. It was a remote area, peaceful, indifferent, as old almost as the hills. But on the next day, Syrian armed units invaded this rural scene and killed two civilians. Hotheads in Syria boasted that this was part of a planned program of harassment that would continue until all Jews were driven into the sea.

Again in 1963, I visited the Kibbutz Ein Gev for one of its famous fish dinners and a lazy afternoon of watching boats drifting across the Sea of Galilee. I also climbed up into the hills in back of Ein Gev to see the incredible kibbutz perched on the last half inch of Israeli soil. As I sat in the dining room, whose windows were shielded by a massive concrete bunker, a young Israeli girl explained, "We have to have the wall to keep out the Syrian bullets, for they shoot at us whenever we sit down to eat." Two days after my visit, a Syrian gun emplacement in the hills lobbed shells into the lake, sank a fishing boat and injured five fishermen. Once more, Syria publicly announced that this was part of a continuing campaign.

My most moving experience came when I visited the beautiful Catholic monastery marking the supposed site of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. It rests on the hills west of Capernaum, where Jesus sometimes argued with scholars, and while I was staying there, I learned that shortly before, in Israeli fields to the east, a Syrian patrol had planned land mines and one had exploded, killing Israeli farmers.

I could go on through the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967, citing incident after incident in which acts of actual warfare were perpetrated in this region. From the high hills that Syria occupied to the east, gun positions pumped in random shots at workers on the Israeli farms. From protected emplacements along the shore of the Sea of Galilee, Syrian guns fired point-blank at Israeli fishermen. And night after night, marauding parties crept over the border to mine, to murder and destroy.

Now, no man in his right mind would claim that Israel in the meantime was sitting idly by in childish innocence, or that it accepted these invasions of its sovereignty without striking back. In self-respect, there had to be retaliations, and there were. These warlike Arab acts, backing up verbal threats, would have been suicidal for the Israeli Government to ignore. Arab leaders now began raising enormous armies with much first-rate equipment, and these gave every evidence of being able to crush Israel. What was most provocative of all, the leaders of this might openly announced that they planned to launch a full-scale war. If ever a nation was forewarned by word and act and specific promise of annihilation, it was Israel.

What were the odds against Israel? A quick glance at the figures—46 million in the surrounding Arab countries, 97 million in all, as against 2.6 million Israelis—might lead one to believe that the Arab states would have little trouble in overwhelming Israel, except that twice before, in 1948 and 1956, they had tried to do so and failed. Arab leaders grew adept in explaining away the somber fact that twice, a handful of Jews had resisted efforts to throw them into the sea. "In 1948," explained the leaders, "we were betrayed by Great Britain, and in 1956, it was the French and English armies that defeated us through their invasion of the Suez." By June, 1967, a persuasive legend had grown up, largely masking the truth that the Arab states had ever tested arms with the Israelis, and completely ignoring that in each war, the Israelis had been victorious. In a magic flood of words, history was repealed.

The Arab leaders created an enticing world of fantasy; one demagogue lived on the pronouncements of the other, and in time, all

came to believe that facts were other than they had been. When the Arab armies were able to import huge supplies of modern weapons from their East European supporters, they really believed that their peasant levies, with little stake in their society to fight for, would stand up against Israelis who had good homes, better universities and a deep moral commitment to their nation.

I have had two opportunities to witness the impact of this fantasy world upon rational Arabs. In one of my books, I described in some detail the manner in which, in 1948, Jewish youths captured the north Israel city of Safad against overwhelming numbers of Arab soldiers. At no point in my description did I deride the Arabs or cast aspersions upon them. Some dozen correspondents in the different Arab nations commented upon this favorably when they wrote to me complaining about the passage. What they objected to were the facts I presented. Some claimed that the Jews must have numbered 20 or 30 times their known strength. Others argued that Arab units that we know to have been in the city were not really there. Several explained that the loss was due to British perfidy in turning over to the Jews the best military sites, whereas the truth was just the opposite. And all expressed the opinion that I had been tricked by a legend that had not really happened. I had the strange feeling that my correspondents trusted that one morning, they would waken to find that Safad had never really been lost at all, that it was still in Arab hands and that maps and stories to the contrary had been mere propaganda.

Of course, in the preceding paragraph, I am generalizing from a dozen letters, none of whose authors did I see personally, and it may be that I am reading into their letters a greater evidence of fantasy than the writers showed. About my second experience, I cannot make such an error, for it I witnessed in person.

In the summer of 1964, I was vacationing by the lovely city of Alexandria, made famous by the writers of antiquity and by Charles Kingsley and Lawrence Durrell, and one day at sunset, as I was strolling along that unequalled boulevard that runs besides the Mediterranean, I came to a park where in the evening, a concert of folk music was offered. Now, I am very partial to this form of entertainment, for one learns much from uncontaminated folk songs. So I bought a ticket for the performance.

At the concert, I found a large number of Egyptian families with their children. It was a splendid night, filled with stars and coolness, and we sat back to watch a first-class performance of folk song and dance. The choruses were strong, the dancers agile, and the evening compared with others I had enjoyed in Kyoto, Djakarta, Manila and Mexico City.

A rather large cast performed, and this made me wonder where the money to pay them came from, for the audience was not unusually big, and the prices we had paid were only nominal. I shrugged my shoulders and concluded that this was someone else's problem, but when the regular performance had ended, without a false note that I could detect, the bugles started blowing, excitement gripped the children in the audience, and the curtains parted to show a scene in the year A.D. 2000. In a park much like the one in which we were sitting, a group of children played about the statue of an Egyptian soldier while an old man watched. One of the children asked who the statue was, and by means of a dance, the old fellow explained. Years dropped from his shoulders. His cane became a gun. His ragged clothes fell away to reveal a military uniform, and as more bugles blew, ghosts of his former companions in arms appeared on stage, and in wonderfully choreographed

pantomime, the Egyptian Army demonstrated how it had won the great war of 1956.

The scene was at Suez, where a handful of heroic Egyptians held off and finally defeated not an Israeli army but invaders storming ashore from French and English battleships. For each Egyptian soldier, scores of Frenchmen and Englishmen rushed onstage, only to be overwhelmed by sheer courage. In the end, the invaders had to retreat, whereupon the Egyptian defenders fell into a tableau of victory as fine as any I had ever seen. The great powers had been driven off, and Egyptian honor was once more secure.

I looked about me at the audience, and it was apparent that the adults, many of whom must have participated in the events thus portrayed, had begun to accept this version as history. Their eyes glowed, and a real patriotism suffused their faces. As we left the park, I saw one young boy of nine or ten lunging out with an imaginary bayonet to hold off imaginary Frenchmen and Englishmen. When I made inquiries about the performance, I found that it was paid for by the government and was repeated throughout the year.

The whole thing was fantasy, of course, and certainly no worse than similar versions of English history offered in London or French history in Paris. I am sure that parallel perversions could be found in American folklore, and I doubt that much harm is done to children by this patriotic nonsense. But in the case of Egypt and the other Arab lands, there was an additional danger because adults, too, were accepting such fables: college professors, university students, newspaper editors, businessmen believed that Egypt had won a great victory in 1956. I could find no evidence that anyone in public life was willing to admit that in Egypt's military adventure against a handful of Jews, the latter had easily won.

All nations engage in fantasy, but few indulge themselves with so virulent a dream as the twofold Arab dream that Israel does not exist and that the Jews who presently occupy the land of Israel can easily be pushed into the Mediterranean . . . whenever the Arabs finally decide to do so.

Sometime in the spring of 1967, the Arab leaders decided that the time was ripe. Under incessant pressure from Ahmed Shukairy, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who stood to win himself the satrapy of Palestine if he could goad Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan and Saudi Arabia into declaring war on Israel, and with the full connivance of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who stood to win himself an emperorship if the war was successful, the Arab nations reached an understanding. These men who had lived so long on fantasy now conceived the supreme fantasy that they could quickly destroy the nation that had twice defeated them and had in the interim grown stronger socially, psychologically and morally, even though its airplanes and tanks had not kept pace in numbers with those of the Arabs.

On May 16, 1967, President Nasser initiated the two final moves. On that day, he elbowed the United Nations Emergency Force out of its peacekeeping positions along the Egyptian-Israeli border in the Sinai Peninsula and forced it ignominiously to retire from the area, thus depriving Israel of the one slim assurance it had that a surprise attack would not be launched from the desert. The fire engine that was supposed to protect the community scuttled out of town at the first smell of smoke. In its place, President Nasser moved up his own divisions, and the stage was set for war.

On May 22, 1967, he made his second crucial move. With the retreat of the United Nations troops, he found himself in sole control of Sharm el Sheik, the fortress-commanding the strait leading into the Gulf of Aqaba. It was a simple matter for him to an-

nounce that henceforth, the Gulf would be closed to Israeli ships and even to ships of other nations carrying strategic materials bound for Israel. None would be permitted to enter and none to leave. This was a hostile act and had to be construed as a declaration of war. That President Nasser was aware of the gravity of his act, he took no pains to hide: "Sharm el Sheik and the blockade mean real confrontation with Israel. Taking such a step means that we should be ready to enter full-scale war with Israel. It is not an isolated operation."

The Gulf has been recognized as an international waterway because four sovereign nations line its coasts: on the east, Saudi Arabia; on the west, Egypt; on the north, Israel; and on the northeast, Jordan. But it is more important economically to Israel than to any of the other three, since Elath is a major port for handling oil and other heavy cargoes. If the Gulf of Aqaba were to be closed to all shipping, whether to Jordan or Israel, the blockade would damage Jordan, but it would prostrate Israel. However, ships intended for Jordan were allowed to pass, and during the exercise of the blockade, several did proceed unmolested to Jordan. This underlined the fact that the blockade was meant to be an act of war, and lest any mis-understand the intention, President Nasser proclaimed on May 26:

"The Arab people want to fight . . .

"We have been waiting for the suitable day when we shall be completely ready, since if we enter a battle with Israel we should be confident of victory and should take strong measures. We do not speak idly.

"We have lately felt that our strength is sufficient, and that if we enter the battle with Israel we shall, with God's help, be victorious. Therefore, we have now decided that I take real steps.

"The battle will be a full-scale one, and our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

Obviously, the major maritime nations of the world, having anticipated that such a blockade might one day be attempted, in which case their ships would be powerless to enter the narrow strait, had long been on record regarding two points: (1) the Gulf of Aqaba was an international waterway, and (2) as such, it must be kept open for all nations to use equally without let or hindrance.

By flouting international law and blockading the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, President Nasser had effectively and somewhat cleverly cut Israel's lifeline to the south. If the blockade were allowed to continue unchallenged, Israel would experience what its Arab neighbors had been threatening for so long—its strangulation. This was war, but still only an indirect version, in the economic field. One could reasonably hope that from it, President Nasser might back away, but such hopes were dashed on May 28, when he announced over the radio: "We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel."

As the Arabs prepared for what they assured themselves was to be the final conquest of Israel, their morale was at high pitch. And because of what they had been told so continuously over the previous eight years regarding their victory over the British and French in 1956, they believed in all honesty that this time they were going to crush Israel, and fairly easily.

President Nasser encouraged this belief by his belligerent speeches. From Syria, Chief of State Al-Attassi thundered that his army was impatient to begin marching.

The foot soldiers, the aviators, the tank commanders and even the generals prepared to launch what they were convinced would be an easy, victorious sortie. In the fantasy world in which they had lived for so long, and to which they had contributed, words took the place of accomplishment, wishes

took the place of military discipline, and inflated dreams of revenge superseded facts.

If the Arabs with their verbal assaults had made life difficult for Israel, they had perpetrated a worse crime against themselves: for they had come to believe their own inflated nonsense.

At the hour of attack, the Voice of the Arabs radio station in Cairo issued this stirring call to its soldiers. It is the usual heartening battle cry that all nations use at a time of crisis and in general purpose is not much different from what Englishmen or Russians or Americans would shout to their soldiers: but in the cry for avenging 1948, one hears a unique and ominous overtone:

"Destroy, ruin, liberate. Woe to Israel, your hour has arrived. The Arab nation is on its way to render its account. O Israel, this is your end.

"Every Arab must take revenge for 1948, must cross the Armistice lines from all directions and head for Tel Aviv. We shall drive out of existence the shame of Zionism. Rescue the looted Palestine. Hit everywhere till the end.

"There is no room for Israel in Palestine. This is your responsibility. O Arab soldiers! Israel, taste death!"

It required less than 72 hours in June to deflate this bombast.

What can be done to awaken the Arab masses to the reality that Israel stands where it does and will presumably remain there for some centuries? In the aftermath of 1948, the rest of the world permitted and perhaps encouraged the Arabs to follow a policy of blindly refusing to admit that Israel existed. The armistice commissions, which should have worked out regional policies, were not permitted to operate effectively. Decisions upon which peace depended could not be made because the Arabs refused to acknowledge that history had produced an old-new nation that would prove most viable—that was too young to die. The normal intercourse between nations, such as is conducted between Russia and Germany, which were certainly as bitter enemies as Egypt and Israel, was forbidden, and the region fumbled its way to the war of 1956.

When Israel won handily, the refusal to admit realities persisted, and the same errors were allowed to continue. International commissions did not function, and normal intercourse between nations did not mature, even though the Arab portion of the region and the Israeli form a marvelous, interlocking whole—a unit whose various segments could well profit from economic, medical, educational, developmental and planning co-operation. The blindness and the arrogant folly that produced this stalemate also produced the speeches cited in this article. And they in turn produced the hysteria that led to a third war in less than 20 years.

If the world, in 1948, had insisted that the nations of this area sit down in honest consultation, 1956 might have been avoided. If the world, following the disaster of 1956, had insisted that the Arab nations at least awaken to the existence of Israel, the tremendous folly of 1967 could have been avoided. Now, the world has a third chance, and if some right decisions are made in the months ahead, the even greater tragedy of 1977 may be avoided. What is necessary is a reasonable revision of boundary lines; a sensible settlement of the Palestinian refugee problem; a cessation of verbal assault and physical battery; and a union of talents and interests, of resources and abilities, so that the region can move forward to a creative society in which all members live infinitely better than anyone there now does.

Am I hopeful that the world will now sensibly tackle its problems when it refused to do so in the aftermath of 1948 and 1956?

August 10, 1967

I am not. President Gamal Abdel Nasser pulled out of the hat one of the cleverest tricks of his career when, in the first hours of defeat, he invented the enticing theory that once again it was not Israelis who were crushing his armed might from every direction but English and American aviators. His explanation captivated the imagination of all Arabs, and within a few days was adopted as official dogma. In 1970, when I revisit the lovely waterfront of Alexandria, I expect to see a tableau explaining how, in a moment of travail in the spring of 1967, the Egyptians and their Arab allies stood bravely against the combined air might of Great Britain and the United States and repulsed it. That Israel was involved will not be mentioned.

At the moment when Egyptian armies were suffering their worst defeats, Egypt's undefeated radio was broadcasting the following careful analysis of the situation:

"The United States is the enemy. Its fighters and bombers gathered in large groups to provide for Israel an air umbrella that prevents the Arabs from bombing Israel's towns and villages, while it is moving fast all along the occupied frontiers of the Arabs. The United States, therefore, is the aggressor.

"The United States saw Israel about to collapse under the blow of death. The Chicago gangs moved: the state of gangsterism and bloodshed moved; it moved in order to protect its aggressive base in the Middle East. How vile and treacherous the United States has been in its collusion with the Zionists! It refrained from coming out openly to fight us. It refrained from facing the Arabs with an open and daring hostility. No, Arabs. The United States is too vile and too base to have the ethics of cavaliers. The United States threw, from all its airports and aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, huge and continuous massings of its fighters and bombers in order to provide that air umbrella that protected Israel from the revenge of the Arabs, from the massings of the Arabs, and from the victory of the Arabs.

"The battle is continuing, United States. . . . It is going on until you become, as Britain became after the 1956 collusion, third-rate state. Here we shall bury the American international gangsterism. Here, Arabs, dig graves everywhere; dig them for every U.S. existence; dig them. Arabs. Dig all the homeland a grave for U.S. existence. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs.

"The curse of all the Arabs, from the ocean to the gulf and from every corner of the globe, is on you, America, and on your lackey, Israel; together with the curse of all free peoples, the curse of free men everywhere."

On the night when the defeat of the Arab armies was known to the world as one of the most crushing in history, I discussed matters on an all-night radio show with Dr. M. T. Mehdi, secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, and he made these points: "Nothing has changed. Israel is worse than Nazi Germany, and the Arabs will have to drive her from the region. The war will continue precisely as it has been going for the past 19 years. And what the Americans and the English took away from the Arabs by their intervention, the Arabs will recover at the conference table. Peace talks, of course, will have to be conducted through third parties at the United Nations, because no Arab leader will ever agree to sit down and talk with an outlaw nation like Israel. You'll see. The United Nations will force Israel back to her 1948 boundaries, after which all Arab nations will unite in a war to exterminate her, because this is going to be just like the Crusades. For two hundred years, the Arabs will continue their fight and in the end they'll do exactly what they've said. Push Israel into the sea."

Nasser will probably gain more from the Arab world in defeat than he would have

gained in victory. The war made him a tragic hero around whom the emotional Arabs can rally. Soon, his new crop of generals will be making the old speeches of 1948, 1956 and 1967. His people will believe them, for fantasy is impossible to eradicate if one's whole society is structured on the perpetuation of the Arabian Nights.

Yet we must dispel that fantasy. To do so is the job to which we are all committed . . . unless we are content to watch this pathetic farce of Arab self-delusion repeated in 1977, 1988 and 1999.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1967]
FANTASY FROM NASSER

President Nasser of the U.A.R. has been variously described as cautious and impulsive, reasonable and irresponsible, calculating and tempestuous. During his thirteen-year career as absolute ruler of his people and aspiring leader of pan-Arab Socialism, Gamal Abdel Nasser has displayed all of these contradictory traits.

In spite of his impulsive seizure of Suez, his irresponsible campaign in Yemen and other forays into international politics, many informed observers have been inclined in the past to minimize the Egyptian leader's excesses, citing his relative caution in comparison to other, more volatile, Arab leaders, and pointing to many reasonable and concrete steps he has taken to try to rebuild Egypt's impoverished and demoralized feudal society.

Today, however, it must be sadly noted that President Nasser has apparently thrown caution and reason to the desert winds.

In calling on Egyptians once more to mobilize their meager resources for continuing warfare against an Israel he refuses to recognize after a third, shattering Egyptian defeat by Israeli armed forces, Nasser has betrayed his promise of a better life for the Egyptian people. He has shown himself to be a prisoner of the extreme Arab emotions he once sought to master.

Speaking on the fifteenth anniversary of the Egyptian revolution the other day, Nasser charged there is "an American imperialist conspiracy to destroy our socialist revolution." "Thus have failure at home, where the economy is a shambles, and defeat abroad reduced a once-promising leader to fantasy.

It is, of course, no American conspiracy but Nasser's own intemperate ambitions and inflexible antipathies that are destroying Egypt's hope to show the way to a better Arab society.

AND REALITY

On the basis of well-authenticated evidence, Egypt has been using and is continuing to use poison gas against Yemeni royalists. The United States has a last made public its belief that gas may have in fact been employed. An investigation by the United Nations Human Rights Commission is clearly called for.

The International Red Cross sent one team to a village called Gahar in north Yemen on May 15. While its report has not yet been officially released, the text has been printed in U.S. News World Report. The Red Cross doctors found proof of the use of toxic gas by the Egyptian forces. Their report has been circulated officially only to Egypt, Saudi Arabia and both sides in the Yemen civil war; but each of these parties has reasons to keep the contents secret.

Two hundred Members of Parliament of all parties in London have just called upon their Government to take the issue to the United Nations Foreign Secretary George Brown indicated that Britain would not take action. Although he did not say so, the reason is presumably that the British do not want to get into more trouble with Egypt. Saudi Arabia, which is most concerned because it is supporting the royalists and because Yemen is on its borders, evidently does not want

further to disturb Arab unity in these critical times.

Washington had been holding back for various reasons. It had no positive proof and still has none, and it too was trying to get along with Nasser. However, relations with Cairo could not get worse than they are now. And the increasing evidence of the use of toxic gas has become too disturbing to ignore. It is believed that in recent bombings the Egyptians have used a modern, sophisticated nerve gas, whereas previously they had used World I phosgene.

The State Department said yesterday that it will support international action to investigate this horror. Washington should do more. It should initiate such action.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1967]

ISRAEL FAKED EGYPT OUT OF HER SOCKS
(Excerpts from an article entitled "The 6-Day War" by Randolph and Winston Churchill)

It all started with a lie—a Russian lie. In early May, the Soviet government passed to Cairo the story of a large Israeli troop concentration on the Syrian border. During the following two weeks, Cairo received information from Moscow indicating that an Israeli force of up to 11 brigades was involved. At the time, the Israelis had no more than a company (120 men) in that particular area, waiting in ambush for Syrian saboteurs.

The United Nations, which had observation posts along the Israeli-Syrian border, confirmed, toward the end of May, that it had no evidence of the alleged troop movements. It seems that the Russians, alarmed by the possibility that Israel might be planning a punitive raid on Syria, wanted Egyptian President Nasser to commit his forces in Sinai as a diversion to deter the Israelis from attacking.

The crisis had been building up for six months. In October and November, 1966, there had been an intensification of Arab terrorist activities against Israel by the El Fatah terrorist organization. On Nov. 4, Syria and Egypt signed a defense agreement. There followed two incidents in which the Israelis undertook major punitive action.

On Nov. 13, a large Israeli force, including tanks and armored cars, rolled over the Jordanian border and attacked Samu, a village of 4000 people. Israel felt no great hostility toward Jordan but carried out the raid in order to show that she was not prepared to tolerate the use of Jordanian territory by the El Fatah organization.

At the beginning of April, 1967, the Israelis decided to knock out Syrian artillery which was bombarding Israeli farm workers in a demilitarized zone near the Sea of Galilee. In the resulting air battle of April 7, the Syrians lost six Mig fighters, a significant proportion of their total air strength.

EMBARRASSING FOR NASSER

The situation was clearly becoming increasingly embarrassing for President Nasser. In particular, the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force, commanded by Gen. Rikhye of India, on the borders of Egypt and Israel was a subject of scandal and scorn among his Arab rivals.

Nasser, believing that a confrontation between Israel and Syria was imminent, felt bound to demonstrate the reality of his defense pact with Syria by some evidence of military zeal. On May 15, large numbers of Egyptian troops were seen moving through Cairo on their way to the Suez Canal. They were accorded the maximum publicity by the government-controlled press, radio and television.

Then at 10 p.m. on May 18, the Egyptian chief of staff, Gen. Fawzy, sent a telegram to Gen. Rikhye:

"For your information, I gave my instructions to all U.A.R. armed forces to be ready for action against Israel the moment it

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

might carry out any aggressive action against any Arab country . . . For the sake of complete security (sic) of all U.N. troops which install O.P.'s along our borders, I request that you issue orders to withdraw all these troops immediately . . ."

Gen. Rikhye immediately reported the Egyptian request to United Nations Secretary General U Thant in New York and retired to bed. The broadcasts of Cairo Radio the next day made it clear that Gen. Rikhye had been asked to withdraw his men from the border and concentrate them inside the Gaza Strip. No mention was made of the United Nations forces at Sharm El-Sheikh. However, after receiving Fawzy's telegram, U Thant called on Ambassador El Kony, the Egyptian representative at the United Nations, and informed him that a partial withdrawal of the force was impossible. Nasser was therefore told he must either request the complete withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force from Egyptian territory or else allow it to remain in its existing positions.

HAMMARSKJOLD LEGACY

UNEF was the peacekeeping force which had controlled the border since the time of Suez. It had originally been established there under an agreement concluded between President Nasser and the late Dag Hammarskjold, then United Nations Secretary General, in November, 1956.

Egypt and the United Nations, according to this document, made a compact that no withdrawal should take place before the "task" was accomplished. In the event of an Egyptian request for the United Nations troops to leave, Hammarskjold recorded, "the matter would at once be brought before the General Assembly. If the General Assembly found that its task was completed, everything would be all right. If they found that the task was not completed, and Egypt, all the same maintained its stand and enforced the withdrawal, Egypt would break the agreement with the United Nations."

Though U Thant has pointed out that the Hammarskjold memorandum was not an official United Nations document, it is interesting to note how far he departed from his predecessor's code of action.

In the event, however, the Egyptians had not waited for any formal response from U Thant. By 8 a.m. on May 17, they were already taking over UNEF observation posts along the Egyptian-Israeli border. In Cairo, Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad called in the envoys of each of the seven nations contributing to UNEF and demanded the withdrawal of their contingents, receiving immediate assent from the Yugoslavs and Indians.

Shortly after midday on May 18, the Egyptians ordered the force of 32 United Nations troops manning observation posts at Sharm El-Sheikh to withdraw immediately. It was 4 p.m. when the official Egyptian request for withdrawal of the force reached the United Nations—too late for U Thant to preserve the integrity of the force.

At a brief ceremony in Gaza on May 19, the flag of the United Nations was lowered and UNEF was no more—an ignominious and abrupt demise.

Perhaps no one was more surprised than Nasser when U Thant acceded to his demands so promptly without even consulting the Security Council or the General Assembly.

On May 22, the crisis entered a new stage when Egypt declared the Strait of Tiran closed to Israeli ships and to all strategic materials being shipped to Israel on board non-Israeli vessels. President Nasser declared: "If Israel threatens us with war, we will reply thus: Go ahead, then."

On May 23, Levi Eshkol, the Israeli Prime Minister, warned that interference with Israeli shipping in the Strait of Tiran would be regarded as an act of war.

On May 25, there were signs of mounting pressure on the Israeli Prime Minister for Israel to "go it alone." President Johnson

flew to Canada to discuss the crisis with Prime Minister Lester Pearson. The same day, the Egyptian Defense Minister, accompanied by a ten-man delegation, arrived in Moscow to seek Russian support and material.

EBAN'S TREK WEST

On May 24, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban left for Washington, via Paris and London, to see President Johnson and later to address the United Nations Security Council.

On May 26, after keeping Eban waiting for most of the day, Mr. Johnson called him in for a talk. The President was disconcerted when Eban produced a file of documents which the Israelis considered to be evidence of a firm American commitment to uphold the principle of "free and innocent passage" through the Gulf of Aqaba.

Among these papers was the draft of a speech made by his immediate predecessor, Golda Meir, to the United Nations General Assembly on March 1, 1957. This had been prepared jointly by Eban, at that time Israeli Ambassador in Washington, and John Foster Dulles, and amended in Dulles' own hand.

Eban also reminded Mr. Johnson during their 85-minute conversation of the President's record on the issue. When Mr. Johnson was Senate Democratic Leader in 1955-6-7, he had been strongly pro-Israel. He had burst into public anger when Dulles threatened Israel with sanctions unless she withdrew from Sharm El-Sheikh.

In his talk with Eban, Mr. Johnson was full of friendly bluster—"I want to see that little blue and white Israeli flag sailing down those straits"—but would make no firm commitment.

Eban was asked to give Washington ten days or a fortnight for negotiations.

Eban genuinely believed that something might be achieved through negotiations; he has argued in private since the war that for the sake of Israel's international reputation it was essential that the diplomatic method be tested, even though it might be found wanting. He also maintained that Israel might have been accused of indecent haste had she struck the moment the strait was closed.

DESTROY ISRAEL

On the day of President Johnson's meeting with Eban, the situation in the Middle East took another decisive turn. President Nasser, addressing the leaders of the Pan-Arab Federation of Trade Unions, said that if war came, "it will be total and the objective will be to destroy Israel. We feel confident that we can win and are ready now for a war with Israel."

The great powers were alarmed by Nasser's recklessness. He appeared to be losing his balance. President Johnson sent a note the same day to the Egyptian ambassador in Washington requesting the Egyptians to exercise restraint and not to open fire first. That night Nasser was called out of bed at 3:30 a.m. to hear an urgent message from the Soviet ambassador in Cairo. He told Nasser that Egypt was strongly advised not to initiate the fighting.

While wishing to avoid any confrontation, the Russians were also aware of the inadequate condition of Egyptian military preparations. A team of Soviet inspectors, checking Egyptian airfields, found pilots who had not been airborne for days. Egypt's dummy planes were unconvincing and their real ones were massed together where they would be easy targets.

Nasser's judgment was distorted by the enormous failure of his sycophantic intelligence service, which underestimated the enemy's strength. There is little reason to believe that Nasser was bent on a military showdown with Israel from the outset. However, as Eban has put it, "Nasser was like a man who had gone to Monte Carlo with \$100 and staked it at the roulette wheel. Each time his number came up he became more courageous; he felt that fortune was smiling."

THE TURNING POINT

On May 30, King Hussein of Jordan unexpectedly arrived in Cairo and, after a stay of only six hours, signed a defense agreement with President Nasser. This surprised the Egyptian people as much as foreigners. The two men had for long been at loggerheads, President Nasser having often denounced Hussein as a traitor to the Arab cause.

The defense pact was undoubtedly the turning point between peace and war. Strategically, an alliance between Egypt and Jordan could scarcely be tolerated by Israel. For Israel would now be exposed to attack at its most vulnerable point, the "soft underbelly" where Jordanian territory formed a salient into Israel and provided a hostile base for attack only 12 miles from the Mediterranean coast.

Thus the talkers were being overtaken by events. While President Johnson and Prime Minister Wilson were hawking a document around the world seeking to obtain the support of other maritime nations for concerted action to open the Strait of Tiran, the problem had become a minor issue to Israel. The deadly threat of an Arab military buildup along her borders was paramount.

Israel, with four of five men in her army civilians, could not afford to maintain her forces mobilized indefinitely. But equally, she could not afford to stand down from her high level of mobilization while the imminent danger of a concerted surprise attack by her neighbors existed.

It was an intolerable situation for her. Throughout the country, and particularly in the army, there was growing unrest and dissatisfaction. It was one of those rare occasions in a democracy when public opinion in a non-election year was able to bring real pressure to bear on a government.

With their veteran leader Ben-Gurion in retirement, the Israeli people turned now to one man—Gen. Moshe Dayan, the Sinal victor of 1956. From Dayan they would accept a decision to fight or to wait with complete conviction that the decision had been taken for sound reasons.

Shimon Peres, one of the leading lights of the Rafi Party, has described the problems which confronted Israel in the days leading up to the war: "There were two questions to be resolved—the decision to go or not to go, and secondly, who should bear the responsibility for that decision. There was growing resentment in the country and in the army, not because the government hadn't decided on war—but because it had taken no decision." Rafi was, broadly, the party of the "hawks," while the "doves" put their trust in Eshkol and Eban of the Mapai Party.

By May 24 Peres was the organizing center of a political alliance which could muster 50 of the Knesset's 120 votes, and which aimed to overthrow Eshkol.

Discussions with the government went on vainly up to and throughout May 31 in an attempt to get Dayan accepted in a position of authority, either as Prime Minister or Minister of Defense. Dayan was pessimistic and depressed. Eshkol was prepared to have him in but only in an advisory capacity, offering him the deputy premiership or membership of the government's inner committee for defense, which consisted of 13 people. Both positions would have involved responsibility without power.

Then at 3 p.m. on June 1, there was a meeting of the secretariat of Mapai at which 24 people spoke. Of these, 19 supported Dayan and only five backed Allon, the chief of staff and now Minister of Labor. At 7 p.m., Eshkol and delegates of Rafi met and it was agreed that Dayan should have the Defense Ministry. This meeting lasted no more than 10 minutes.

An hour later, the Rafi leadership met in Ben-Gurion's house. After two hours of discussion, Ben-Gurion approved Dayan's appointment. By 11 p.m. the cabinet met and

August 10, 1967

Dayan's inclusion as Defense Minister was among the three additions made.

It is now a controversial issue in Israeli politics as to who should be given credit for the decision to strike and for the successful conduct of the war. Dayan's admirers claim that when he entered the cabinet the decision to fight had yet to be taken, and add that no detailed plan of attack had been worked out.

Brig. Gen. Ezer Weizman has said that when Dayan became Minister of Defense, "he knew that there was a possibility that the decision to go might not be taken." Others claim that the Eshkol government was too fearful to make the decision without him. They wanted Dayan included so that if the whole thing ended in disaster they would not have to hold the bag alone.

Eban and Allon recall events differently from Weizman. Eban says that the decision to fight had been reached by June 1: it was dictated by the pact between Nasser and Hussein. Allon agrees. He says that prior to the defense pact there was a division in the cabinet, a majority still hoping for a diplomatic solution. But after May 30 war was inevitable.

Dayan was included in the cabinet because the Eshkol government was being forced to two unavoidable conclusions: Israel had no alternative but to fight, and the Israeli government needed Dayan because the nation demanded it and because it needed his knowledge, courage and optimism.

Just as it had taken Hitler to make Churchill Prime Minister in 1940, so, as Dayan put it shortly before the start of the war, "it took 80,000 Egyptian soldiers to get me into the Israeli cabinet."

By the time Harold Wilson and Lyndon Johnson met in Washington on June 2, it was too late for a diplomatic formula to succeed. War was certain. Only the date was open.

SAFE TO ACT

By the first weekend in June while diplomacy was taking its course in the world capitals, two things were clear to the Israelis. First, that they would not incur the wrath of the President of the United States as they had done in 1956; secondly, the Soviet Union would not intervene.

Whether this was merely a shrewd assessment of the situation by the Israeli intelligence or whether in fact some wink had been received through unofficial channels from Mr. Johnson is impossible to say. Anyway, the Israelis felt that it was safe for them to act should the situation demand it.

The strategic situation outlined by Gen. Yariv, head of Israeli intelligence, was black. In addition to the fateful kiss between Nasser and King Hussein, the Israelis now knew that Egypt's Gen. Riadh had arrived in Amman to establish an advance command post and that Jordanian forces had been placed under his command. Besides this, on the evening of June 4, the vanguard of an Iraqi infantry division reinforced by more than 150 tanks began crossing the Jordan River into the West Bank area.

The Iraqi buildup would be complete by the middle of the week and posed a grave threat to the security of Israel. While she could cope with 800 or more Egyptian tanks in Sinai, Israel felt that the presence of 300 or 400 enemy tanks so close to her major air bases and centers of population was an intolerable danger.

In addition, the Egyptian air force was getting cocky. For 10 years there had been no intrusion or violation of Israeli air space by Egyptian aircraft. Now, in the past two weeks, at least three flights had been made by Egyptian Mig 21s over Israel from the Dead Sea toward El Arish, a route over some of Israel's major air bases and the area in which the bulk of her armor was deployed.

ANGUISHED DECISION

Israel's final doubts and hesitations were swept away or overcome. By the evening of

June 4 the soldiers and airmen knew that the following morning they would be at war.

It had been an agonizing and anguished decision for the cabinet. When Gen. Hod, the head of the air force, told them that their air force could destroy the air force of Egypt and any other Arab power that intervened without Tel Aviv being subjected to enemy bombardment, they found it hard to believe.

So much had been heard of the new Russian-trained Egyptian air force, equipped with more than 400 modern jet fighters and bombers—how was it possible to knock out such a force with one blow and be sure that Tel Aviv would not be bombed?

But Moshe Dayan was an optimist and he was one of the few who knew that the air force could do what it promised. Dayan's influence over the cabinet was perhaps his most decisive contribution to the victory.

When Dayan assumed the office of Defense Minister June 1, he was already very clearly in the picture. For the previous two weeks, with the permission of both the Prime Minister and the Chief of Staff, Gen. Rabin, he had been visiting the troops in the field and, in particular, going over all the plans with the individual commanders.

Between June 1 and June 4, there can be no doubt that he made several alterations to the plans within the framework of the original conception of the battle. This had been to hold the line of the Jordanian and Syrian fronts while destroying the Egyptian army in Sinai.

For instance, the day before his appointment, Dayan visited Gen. Narkiss, the central commander whose task it was to guard Tel Aviv, the densely populated coastal strip and the Israeli part of Jerusalem from attack, principally by Jordan. They met in Jerusalem and went over the plans, and then went to a vantage point outside Jerusalem from which they surveyed the whole area.

Dayan suggested that Israeli troop movements be kept to the bare minimum so as to offer no provocation to the Jordanians. In case of a Jordanian attack, which it was felt would probably be a local one and in the nature of a demonstration of solidarity with his fellow Arabs by King Hussein, Dayan warned Narkiss: "Don't bother the general staff with requests for reinforcements. Grit your teeth and ask for nothing."

Dayan was known to be a man of action, and on hearing of his inclusion in the Israeli government, many people felt that this would mean that a decision to fight would soon come.

One of the first tasks he set himself was to disguise the world of any such idea by a brilliant deception campaign and thus regain the element of surprise which was vital to Israel. It was at once pointed out that the army, which after two weeks of mobilization and waiting in the desert was demanding that a decision be taken, would accept a decision not to fight far better from a government which included Dayan.

Dayan's first public appearance as Minister of Defense-designate was at a press conference June 3. He said it was too late for a spontaneous military reaction to Egypt's blockade of the Tiran Strait and still too early to draw any conclusions of the possible outcome of diplomatic action. He added: "The government—before I became a member of it—embarked on diplomacy; we must give it a chance."

The following day, the day immediately preceding the outbreak of war, newspaper offices throughout the world received pictures of Israeli troops on leave relaxing on the beaches. Several thousand Israeli soldiers had been authorized to go on leave that weekend.

Following the cabinet sessions at which the decision to strike had been taken, the communique designed for use by papers June 5 mentioned only a banal agenda of items ranging from a new bond issue to the ratification of a cultural accord with Belgium.

There can be no doubt that overall, the Israeli deception achieved its purpose. Egyptian generals were seen that weekend on the tennis courts of Cairo.

PLANS LIKE BRICKS

The armed forces that Dayan was about to lead into battle made up a remarkable and unique military machine, largely composed of farmers, fruit dealers, taxi drivers and businessmen in uniform. In the defense of their own land, they were one of the finest armies the world has ever seen.

There was no overall plan of campaign. Gen. Weizman, director of operations, said: "We have got a plan for everything—even for capturing the North Pole. The plans are like bricks. They can be used one by one to build a structure as the situation develops. We don't go in for preconceived and, therefore, inflexible master plans."

Although the credit for Israel's air victory was to go to Gen. Hod, it was Gen. Weizman who over the past ten years had been architect of the air force. It was his decision to devote available resources to create a strong force of fighter-bombers rather than squander them by having a bomber force as well. A bomber's major role is to bomb centers of civilian population, which Israel had no interest in doing. Gen. Weizman wanted an air force that could destroy any enemy force and which could give support to ground troops.

It was hard to find anyone in Israel in the weeks before the war began who openly wanted war, but without fuss or bother, the men—and women—left their jobs to go and fight for their country. Their greatest strength was that they knew what they were fighting for. They realized that while defeat for the Arabs would mean the loss of an army, for Israel it would mean the end of her existence as a state and the annihilation of her people.

As an Israeli officer who had served with the British army in World War II and who had fought at Alamein put it: "This would have been a second Biblical massacre of Masada. When the Egyptians got here they would have found no one alive. I would have killed my wife and daughter rather than let them fall into their hands. And I don't know anyone who wouldn't have done the same."

IRAQ DETERMINED TO "CRUSH ZIONIST AGGRESSION"—WAR SPIRIT RAMPANT IN BAGHDAD

(By Robert Dietsch)

BAGHDAD, Iraq, July 26.—The elevator bumps to halt on the ground floor of the Hotel Baghdad, the doors glide open and confronting me on the wall is a poster reading: "We shall continue to crush economic interests of American, British and West German supporters of Zionist aggression against our peaceful Arab homeland."

Outside the hotel, pasted on the wall of an East German airline office, another poster says: "Johnson, the servant of capitalists, mule of Zionists."

Two hundred yards down the street, next to the Hungarian Embassy's commercial office, are posted two dozen pictures from Red China. A cherubic Mao Tse-tung smiles from half them.

SOVIET EXHIBIT

Farther down the road is an exhibition of Soviet farm machinery. On the other bank of the Tigris River—which here is 200 yards wide but calm as a mill pond—is the padlocked U.S. Embassy.

It is silent as a tomb and empty except for a Belgian "caretaker" diplomat, a couple of cats and an Arab gardener. Atop the flagpole flies the black, yellow and red flag of Belgium.

Inside the Iraqi Government buildings along the Tigris a new Cabinet rules—appointed last week by President Abdel Rahman Aref after visits to Cairo and Moscow.

The Cabinet includes no overt friends of the West or even middle-of-the-roads, but men whose allegiances today are intertwined

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

with Cairo and Damascus and bent toward Moscow and, perhaps, Peking.

THEY FORGET

This gives an idea of what is happening in Iraq since the Arab-Israeli war. The country completely has forgotten pre-war moves to encourage a limited amount of private enterprise and invite in Western business.

Iraq broke relations with the U.S. on the ground that Washington helped Israel fight the war. No one gives any hope of restoring those ties soon.

There were about 500 Americans in Iraq before the war. Most were evacuated altho the Iraqis indirectly suggested they stay. Today there are only 17 Americans in Baghdad, a city of 1.5 million.

So far as I know, I was the first American granted a visa to visit Iraq since the war. Most Iraqis, even those in government, were surprised to see me here. I was treated courteously, but curtly.

NO NAMES

I got to see only one government officer on an official basis. I talked with half a dozen others with the unspoken understanding I wouldn't use their names. I also met three American businessmen here. I asked to talk with their Iraqi employees, but all refused.

I walked to the streets in safety, but while taking a taxi tour of the city, the driver always told inquiries I was French—especially when were were in thickly populated pro-Nasser mosque areas.

In the past seven weeks, Iraq has aligned itself with Arab extremists in Cairo and Damascus who demand continued aggression against Israel, a continued oil boycott against the U.S., Britain and West Germany, and wider boycotts against Western firms.

Indeed, some sources say Iraq is the loudest voice of all the Arab nations demanding stricter boycotts. Baghdad is flirting openly with Moscow and Peking, talking trade and arms.

NEW PACTS

An Iraqi date-processing firm (produces 80 per cent of the world's dates) has signed a pact with Hungary for a new plant. Poland has won a contract to supply Iraqi railways with 200 cars. Iraq has quit trying for a \$2 million U.S. bank loan, turning instead to France, Russia, and Czechoslovakia.

No U.S. newspapers or magazines have been permitted in Iraq since last month's war. There is strict censorship of Baghdad's eight daily newspapers. All mail is censored and all phone calls are monitored.

Iraq has sent arms, trade and even sports missions to Moscow. The army is in tight control of the country as usual, but the voice of the pro-Nasser army element is growing stronger.

One Iraqi government official said: "Iraq must do like other Arab countries. We have to act as one. We are acting as one."

Numfan Kinaani, under secretary of cultural and guidance affairs and spokesman for the government, told me: "Iraq lacks technicians, scientists, equipment of all kinds, so we search for them among our friends—Russians, Chinese, French.

"Americans working in Iraq deserted us when the fighting began. We don't know why. They just ran away. Those Americans had an attitude like a gazelle—which sees by its ears instead of its eyes. You can't imagine the damage America did itself by its policies during this war."

Like almost every other Iraqi, this official remains convinced the U.S. helped Israel fight and that the U.S. Navy communications ship Liberty was advising Israel.

"The way the Israelis fought, the tactics they used proves someone was helping them," Kinaani said.

DEFEAT'S EFFECT

This statement, heard so often in Arab nations, indicates the full effect of defeat still isn't accepted by Arabs and they can't yet comprehend the extent of their losses.

One American-educated Iraqi official also conceded his country now is turning to the communists. He said:

"No matter who helps you in a plight, you turn to him. It makes no matter what kind of communists—Russian or Chinese. They proved our friends in war."

This official also felt the Arab boycott will be extended to all U.S. and British goods and firms. He thought it already had been done but had not been announced officially.

Kinaani said: "I once was against communism. I was wrong. Communism can't do any more harm to me than did Israel and U.S. policies."

Another U.S.-trained official said: "There is no doubt about it. Many intellectuals in Iraq who were against communism for years now are embracing it. They saw how Moscow helped during the war."

STILL THERE

During the war, Iraq sent two brigades of troops to Jordan where they suffered fairly heavy losses. One brigade still is in Jordan. King Hussein reportedly wants the Iraqis to leave, but they have made no move to do so.

When the Iraqi troops departed for Jordan, President Aref saw them off saying: "See you in Tel Aviv."

The Iraqis were so cocky they talked of the war as a "picnic." In short they believed their own propaganda altho there was no training for mobilization for war.

Despite the continued anti-U.S. and anti-Israel fever not all Iraqis foresee renewed fighting soon. But they feel it must come in the long run. Most Iraqis are convinced Israel wants to grab all the land between the Nile and Euphrates Rivers.

Iraq has been in a series of upheavals since 1958 when Gen. Abdul Karim Kassem overthrew King Faisal and set up the country's first socialist state. Kassem took Iraq out of the Baghdad Pact and terminated several U.S. treaties.

He flirted with communism but in the end took a fairly moderate socialist line. Kassem was toppled in 1963 and for nine months, Iraq was ruled by the extremist Arab socialist Ba'ath Party.

Then the moderates regained power and recently the Aref government did try for economic progress and encouraged participation in major projects with private Western interests.

While Iraq remained basically a socialist state all major industries and almost land are state-owned. As late as last spring, the U.S. Embassy here was telling Washington that progress was being made.

But Western businessmen I talked to here, disclaim any such progress. They say their work was getting less efficient and less productive all the time.

EIGHTY MILLION DOLLARS

The three-week shutdown of oil production and current limited production have cost Iraq an estimated \$80 million. Major agricultural production has slowed because of the flight of Western technicians.

On paper, Iraq has great agricultural, potential. The Tigris and Euphrates River could provide all the water needed.

During the Roman Empire this land—then known as Mesopotamia—was a granary for the empire. But today, 1600 years later, socialist Iraq doesn't produce enough grain even for itself and has to import wheat.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1967]
PUTTING UP WITH AN INCH—LOGIC IMPELS UNITED STATES TO ALLOW TIME TO PASS BEFORE SEEKING MIDDLE EAST SETTLEMENT
(By Joseph Kraft)

Impasse in the Middle East has bred the usual American itch to promote a settlement. But logic still argues for a waiting game, aimed at allowing the forces now dominant in the Arab world to play themselves out.

The initiative in the Arab world, ever since

the Israeli victory, has rested with the extreme left-wing regimes of Algeria and Syria. These governments have been pressing the other Arab states and Russia to keep the pot boiling. On two occasions, they have been able to head off steps that might have been the prologue to a settlement with Israel.

First there is the matter of a summit meeting of Arab leaders. It has been ardently advocated by King Hussein of Jordan. At a summit meeting, Hussein could ask the other Arabs to put up or shut up on the question of helping his shattered state survive. If they failed to meet his needs, as seems certain, the whole world would know about it.

At that point, Hussein would be in a good position to turn to the United States for help, and even for an approach to talks with Israel. But the Algerians and Syrians have, of course, foreseen these possibilities. And so far, they have been able to head off any summit meeting.

A similar situation exists over the matter of a compromise United Nations resolution. As the sponsors of the special session of the General Assembly, the Russians were eager to get some kind of resolution through in order to show that the effort had not been in vain. The United States worked out with the Soviet Union a compromise resolution that would have, at least dimly, recognized Israel's right to exist.

But the Algerians and Syrians saw the resolution as a kind of Soviet quit-claim—freeing the Russians from the obligation to undo Israel's victory. They refused strong Soviet pressure to support the resolution, and they were able to swing the rest of the Arab world with them. That is why the General Assembly had to turn the problem over to the Security Council.

This deadlock has induced among some American officials a keen disposition to find a way out. Behind the scenes there have been heavy Administration pressures on Israel for one-sided concessions. At one point, the United States very nearly switched its United Nations vote from abstention to aye on a Pakistani resolution which in effect called for unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Jerusalem.

This disposition to give way is particularly disquieting because beneath the surface of events there has been a considerable drift away from the extremist lead of Algeria and Syria.

Jordan is obviously eager for talks. The oil-rich states, insofar as they have boycotted Britain and the United States under pressure of the extremists, have the best reasons for wanting a return to business as usual. Most important of all, there is the case of the countries bordering Algeria and Syria.

In Morocco, the regime has been strong enough to jail a well-known labor leader for stirring up anti-Jewish sentiment. In Tunisia, President Habib Bourguiba is ready to recognize Israel diplomatically as soon as peace talks begin. And Iraq—a country dependent on Syria for pipeline access to the Mediterranean—has just sent a new cabinet which looks away from Syria and toward Egypt.

Egypt, of course, is the fulcrum of Arab opinion, the point where decisive swings can be made. And so far, on such issues as the Arab summit and the United Nations resolutions, President Nasser has tried to balance among factions in order to maintain top position in the Arab world.

But Egypt is about the last country in the world able to hold a half-way position in international affairs. It imports food and a wide variety of goods consumed by its middle classes in Alexandria and Cairo.

Every day the Egyptians are losing millions of dollars in foreign exchange from Suez Canal tolls foregone, from an absence of tourists and from the closing down of oil prospecting in Sinai. The country is in serious economic trouble. And for all their generosity with cast-off weapons, the Russians show no sign of picking up the tab.

August 10, 1967

In this situation, doing nothing can be a paying proposition for the United States. The more time goes by, the more the impasse draws on without an agreement, the more there will be promoted the sense of realities which must precede any settlement.

"THE ROAD TO NOWHERE," PROGRAM OF KLZ-TV, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body the work of television station KLZ-TV in Denver and a very remarkable program the station has created to help prevent teenage crime, called "The Road to Nowhere." It was produced by news director Jim Bennett, written and filmed by Roly Dahlquist, and narrated by Don Roberts.

This fine station has an exceptional record of public service down through the years. It has been the winner of almost every major award given for creative public service programming. "The Road to Nowhere" was recently given the coveted "Emmy" station award by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

I also wish to commend KLZ-TV and this fine program for additional benefits it has wrought above and beyond the awards it has won which, besides the Emmy, include the Institute for Education by Radio, Sigma Delta Chi, and Colorado Broadcasters Association.

"The Road to Nowhere" is a most compelling indictment of crime and criminal companions—but presented in such a manner as to cause teenagers to stop and think—really stop and think—before embarking on a life of crime. Prisoners tell the story of their own tragic lives in an attempt to let youngsters know of the futility of disobeying lawful school, church, and parental authority. In an era that has seen too much disregard for rightful authority, the tone of this program is most refreshing—particularly when it is set by the prisoners themselves.

KLZ-TV is making prints of this half-hour program available free to television stations around the United States with only two conditions attached; one, that the film be shown at a time when young viewers have the best opportunity to see it; two, that a contribution in the amount of the station's choice be sent to the nonprofit New Life Foundation in Denver, an organization dedicated to the rehabilitation of prisoners on parole, and an organization which feels it will be using the film for at least 5 years. Already "The Road to Nowhere" has been shown in many States and prints have been requested by five foreign countries.

A Denver juvenile court judge keeps a film print in his office to show to teenagers brought before him. The station itself has telecast it three times since its first showing in November 1966, in prime evening time. More than 275 private showings of the film have been made to club, civic, church, and school groups in the Denver area to audiences totaling more than 26,000 and reservations for private showings, now handled by Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce, have been made for several months in advance.

Television, like any other media, fulfills its noblest function when it moves people to the good and better things of life; when it motivates without preaching; when it corrects and changes without the discipline ever being noticed. "The Road to Nowhere" is an example of local television at its finest.

I congratulate KLZ-TV Denver, one of the Time-Life Broadcast family members, on a contribution in the public interest that through its fine program "The Road to Nowhere" will be serving people for years to come.

I think every Senator here would be interested in seeing this program and making it available to the people of his own State. It is truly a very contributive documentation.

THE UNITED NATIONS—THE U.S. RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, press reports on yesterday indicate that the executive branch is giving "serious consideration" to calling up the U.S. resolution on Vietnam which has been in a limbo at the Security Council since the beginning of the year. I am delighted that the Departments are thinking of the possibility because I know and can assert that the administration is most vitally interested in the approach at the U.N. which was discussed the other day by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and myself.

I should like at this point to clarify what is involved in this approach, inasmuch as there are indications on the basis of press reports from Moscow and other sources that some sort of miracle or instant U.N. solution is expected by the Senator from Kentucky and myself. That is the last thing that is anticipated. What is expected, however, is an end to the head-in-the-sand official position which has been taken by the U.N. from the outset. What is expected is a formal effort by the U.N. Security Council to create at least a small opening to peace, a small crack in the wall of war.

Reports from the Soviet Union indicate doubt in that nation as to the usefulness of the U.N. and a preference for a Geneva conference, yet the Soviet Union has not moved to convene a meeting of the Geneva conference—even though it is a cochairman, and even though Great Britain, the other chairman, has indicated time and time again its willingness to join with Moscow to call for a reconvening of that conference.

U Thant has reiterated that he is doubtful that any useful contribution can be made by the Security Council; yet he is not pursuing any unilateral efforts at this time and has announced that he has no intention of doing so.

I am impelled, therefore, to reiterate, that the potential of the U.N., to contribute to peace in Vietnam has not been explored, much less utilized. The U.N. is not a one-man show or a one-nation show. It is an organization with a charter and procedures for moving in the kind of situation which exists in Vietnam.

This Nation should welcome help from third parties, Mr. President, but we cannot and should not wait for them to pursue our diplomacy for us. We do not have

to appeal to others to take an initiative on behalf of peace; we can take the initiative ourselves. The procedures of the Security Council are open to this Nation as they are to any other to act on behalf of its own interests in the restoration of peace.

This Nation can move, in effect, to call up the resolution which we introduced and see to it, if necessary, that the question of taking it up is voted. The motion is procedural and not subject to the veto. And if the resolution is taken up, this Nation can move to see to it that all who might be directly or indirectly involved in the restoration of peace in Vietnam are asked to appear before the Security Council in a discussion of this question—if not in New York, then somewhere else, perhaps in Geneva, in open session, face-to-face meeting.

The invitation, moreover, can include not only China and Hanoi but the NLF or any other relevant party as well. The motion to invite, too, on the basis of precedent is procedural and not subject to veto.

At this late date I think it is essential that the world know where every member of the U.N. Security Council stands—where we stand, where the Soviet Union, China, Hanoi, and all others stand—on the readiness to come to grips in preliminary open discussions of the problems of restoring peace in Vietnam, to the end that we may begin to find some basis for the restoration of peace.

Again, Mr. President, I compliment the executive branch and the Department of State for giving serious consideration to this matter, and I express the hope that this Nation will take the lead in calling up its own resolution on Vietnam at the Security Council in the near future. If we are compelled to insist upon votes on preliminary and procedural questions, then I believe votes are in order, indeed, long overdue. In my judgment, win or lose, the effort to open discussions on peace in Vietnam at the U.N. Security Council is properly made and should be made at this time. Indeed, this Nation has everything to gain and nothing to lose by making the effort.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, again, as I have in the past, I support the call of the distinguished majority leader to our Government to ask that it take the initiative, without any reservation, to bring the matter of Vietnam before the Security Council of the United Nations. I agree with him that whatever may be the disposition of other members of the Security Council, and notwithstanding statements of U Thant that it might not be the most favorable time, one never knows what is the most favorable time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky be recognized for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Now is the most favorable time to do what is right and neces-

August 10, 1967

projects or activities assisted under Federal programs to which funds may be allocated pursuant to this section.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND

Sec. 104 (a). There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Economic Opportunity Trust Fund" (hereinafter referred to as the "Trust Fund"). The Trust Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Trust Fund as provided in this section.

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the Trust Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 33 1/3 per centum of the taxes which may be received under a surcharge on individual and corporate income tax liabilities.

(c) The amounts appropriated by paragraph (b) shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts, referred to in paragraph (b), received in the Treasury. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Funds, as repayable advances or otherwise, such additional sums as may be required to make the expenditures referred to in subsection (f).

(e) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold and manage the Trust Funds, and to the extent necessary and appropriate he shall have for this purpose the same powers as are conferred upon him by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959 (23 U.S.C. sec. 101) to hold and manage the Highway Trust Fund.

(f) Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available for expenditure and allocation under section 102 of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 105 (a). The President shall carry out the programs established in this Act during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, and during the succeeding eight fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$3 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for succeeding years such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law through June 30, 1977.

(b) Such authorizations and any such appropriations shall be in addition to authorizations and appropriations already made for programs eligible for assistance under this Act.

(c) Funds authorized and appropriated pursuant to this Act shall remain available for allocation or expenditure for two additional fiscal years after the fiscal year for which they were authorized and appropriated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I conclude as follows: We have all been talking, at least a good deal of debate has been had, about the Marshall plan. I have done my best to implement this concept, in order to lay before the Senate what can conceivably be done in more specific terms than those which are usually loosely used when we speak of the Marshall plan. I have come up with a figure, Mr. President, and a plan by which this might be started. I commend it to my fellow Senators for study and careful thought.

As one who has lived a full lifetime in and with the slums, I can tell my fellow Senators that I do not believe the job

can be done any differently than through a massive application of resources at a given target within a given period of time. The means must be massive.

Finally, Mr. President, this effort would infinitely more than pay for itself, even in the hardest-headed financial terms, in terms of increases in income, in the improved vitality and skills of our people, in the devotion of our people to the American system, and in the enormously increased tax base which will result for cities and States.

It is accomplishable, Mr. President. Indeed, the figure which I have named—\$50 billion—is a fraction of the gross annual product of the United States for 1 year.

This is the order of magnitude which is required. It implements the words "Marshall plan," which are magic words. The idea was an enormous success on the foreign front and I think it can be on the domestic front. It offers to the Senate a plan and a channel through which this accomplishment can be effected.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in the Record of August 8, 1967, on page S11089, my name appears as a cosponsor of amendment No. 246, which is referred to on that page. My name is included among the names of sponsors in error; and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LETHAL GAS IN YEMEN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, persistent accounts of the use of lethal gas in Yemen have appeared from time to time in the Nation's press. Some of these charges were investigated by an International Committee of the Red Cross.

On July 28, 1967, the New York Times published the full text of the Red Cross report, as follows:

TEXT OF THE RED CROSS REPORT ON THE USE OF POISON GAS IN YEMEN

(By André Rochat)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—On May 11, 1967, the I.C.R.C. delegation in Jidda received appeals for assistance from the two villages of Gadafa and Gahar in the Wadi Herran, in the southwestern Jauf. According to these appeals a proportion of the inhabitants of these villages had been poisoned by gas dropped from raiding airplanes.

Some hours later this news was confirmed by representatives of the Yemeni Royalists and by the Saudi Arabian authorities, who requested the I.C.R.C. delegation to go immediately to the assistance of the victims.

The head of the delegation decided to proceed immediately to the scene, accompanied by another delegate, two doctors and a male nurse; members of the I.C.R.C. medical team, and a Yemeni escort. The two-lorry convoy, loaded with food and medical supplies, left Amara on May 13, after having given due notice of its line of march and timetable to the Egyptian authorities.

Unfortunately, following an air attack on the I.C.R.C. convoy, it was not until the night of May 15-16 that the mission reached Gahar. This village is situated atop a hill some 500 feet in height. All the houses are

clustered closely together, giving the appearance of a small fortress.

ACCOUNTS OF SURVIVORS

According to the inhabitants, 75 people were gassed during a raid in the early hours of May 10, 1967.

The account given by the survivors is as follows:

The bombers circled the village for some time then dropped three bombs on the hillside, east of and below the village, two or three hundred yards away to windward (wind direction from east to west).

No houses were damaged. The explosions were relatively mild. The bomb craters were about eight feet in diameter and 20 inches deep, smaller than the usual craters.

Twenty minutes after dropping the three gas bombs, the planes dropped four or five high-explosive bombs on the village and the western flank of the hill. Only one of these bombs caused any damage; this was sustained by a house in the center of the village.

Many animals, including almost 200 cattle, sheep, goats, donkeys and numerous birds, were also killed. The villagers, who were not contaminated, buried the dead animals in a large pit west of the village, whilst the 75 humans killed were buried in four large communal graves.

REPORT OF OBSERVATIONS

The I.C.R.C. delegates, for their part, observed the following:

They inspected the village for several hours, checking, whenever possible, the accuracy of the information mentioned above.

The doctors examined the four surviving gas casualties. Their medical report is attached hereto.

The head of the mission had one of the four communal graves opened. There were 15 corpses in it. An immediate autopsy by Dr. Brutschin and Dr. Janin left no doubt that death was due to pulmonary edema (see attached medical report and photograph).

The 75 gas casualties were either within range of the gas when it was released or were in its path as it was blown by the wind. Some of the victims were found dead in their homes, as if they had died in their sleep.

Other inhabitants, working in the fields or watching over the livestock, were eastward of the area where the gas bombs fell, some of them very near to the spot, and none of them were affected.

The four survivors who were in the contaminated area are all in pain from their eyes and almost blind. All have pains in the chest and none has any wound.

The doctors cannot testify to an air raid with gas bombs of which they were not personally witness. On the other hand, they stress that all the evidence leads to the conclusion that edema was caused by the breathing of poison gas.

The delegates were later informed that on May 17 and 13 the villages of Gabas, Nofal, Gadr and, for the second time, Gadafa were raided with gas bombs and that as a result 243 persons were killed.

Mr. President, the use of lethal gas in Yemen has been reported on several other occasions by British as well as Yemeni sources. The Israel Government reported that gas containers were found in the Sinai desert at positions evacuated by the retreating Egyptian Army in the wake of the Arab-Israel conflict.

Mr. President, the use of gas in warfare was specifically condemned by the 1925 Geneva Convention.

As an instrument of death, poison gas does not discriminate between soldier and civilian. Borne by the prevailing

August 10, 1967

My bill would make a start on this effort by providing new money for the first 2 of these 10 years through an earmarking of one-third of the revenues of the President's proposed income surtax, thereby producing about \$5 billion over the 2-year period. If the income surtax is not passed, the bill would make the added funds available by direct authorization and appropriation of \$5 billion in new funds.

The sound and fury of congressional and public reaction to the riots has already produced the introduction of bills to provide emergency assistance. But the riots which have racked American cities in recent weeks are evidence of a deep-seated social illness which will not be cured in a day or a year. The breakdown of an orderly and adequate system for the redress of grievances and the widespread alienation of a significant portion of our population present a major national crisis which requires a major national commitment of long duration. Short-term and emergency measures are needed, but they must not divert us from the opportunity of seizing this occasion to face up to the long-term needs—of recognizing them and charting them out. The Administration must not and the Congress must not simply divert funds from one purpose to another to meet the emergency needs of the hour and let it go at that. This is robbing Peter to pay Paul. We must heed the call of the Marshall plan concept for our cities, which was to my knowledge first raised by Whitney Young of the Urban League and was endorsed by me over a year ago and most recently by Vice President HUMPHREY and others, to make a new commitment and to advance new funds.

My proposal would not create new programs. We have, in model cities, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Housing Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and in other laws of this type, all or most of the program authority which we need. What we do not have are the necessary authorizations and appropriations within this existing framework. The bill I am introducing would make new money available to the President to be allocated to these existing programs, or to new programs serving the same purposes, to increase their impact over the next 2 years and would include a moral commitment if the program went well to continue it for a decade. The President would also be authorized to use such funds to help public and private organizations to meet their responsibilities under these Federal programs to provide non-Federal matching funds.

The money for these purposes would come from either of two sources. First, and preferably, the bill would earmark one-third of the revenues to be raised under the President's new 2-year income surtax proposal if it is enacted into law, for expansion of these anti-slum and anti-poverty programs. We are told that this is not a war tax; if that be the case then let us be sure of that fact by allocating some of its revenues to domestic programs of overriding priority. Since it is expected that \$6.3

billion would be raised in fiscal year 1968, and more in fiscal year 1969, this earmarking provision would make funds on the order of \$5 billion available over the next 2 years for expansion of the programs designed to cure urban ills. The bill provides a carryover of funds so that if any amounts were not expended in the year for which they were appropriated they could be carried over for use in the succeeding 2 fiscal years.

Funds thus earmarked from the President's proposed income surtax would be appropriated to an "economic opportunity trust fund," similar in operation to the highway trust fund.

The establishment of this trust fund assures a minimum level of expenditures and continuity for the programs dedicated to eliminating poverty and providing economic security.

It should be noted that earmarking a prescribed percentage of general revenues for a specific purpose is not unusual on the State level. In my own State of New York, for example, the law requires that one-ninth of the State's personal income tax collections be deposited in a fund now devoted to financing bonds for the construction of mental health facilities.

A second approach provided in the bill is direct authorization of appropriations from general Treasury revenues of \$2 billion in fiscal year 1968 and \$3 billion in fiscal year 1969. If funds were forthcoming under the earmarking of the income surtax appropriations to implement this new authorization would not have to be enacted. As evidence of the congressional intent to carry on these programs until the need is satisfied, the bill makes reference to authorizations extending through fiscal year 1977 in the same manner in which the original Marshall plan legislation of 1948 sought, in similar terms, to indicate U.S. commitment over a 4-year period without actually committing funds beyond the first year.

This is an experience very fresh in my mind, as I participated in drafting that very provision of the Marshall plan.

The \$5 billion that my bill would make available would, of course, only be the beginning in terms of really meeting the problem. I would hope that after these first 2 years of additional allotments the administration would recognize the need and would build up its existing programs to needed levels.

And, let me think that these levels would tax our capacities beyond reasonable limits, for, as the freedom budget pointed out, a provision of \$18.5 billion a year would amount to an average of only 2 percent of the estimated annual gross national product between the 1966-75 period. And as the authors of that report so aptly pointed out: What could better illustrate that the whole question of whether we "can afford" the "freedom budget" is a moral question and not an economic issue?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, in accord-

ance with the request of the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 2274) to provide additional funds for programs designed to eradicate poverty and urban slums by reserving certain revenues raised under a surcharge on income tax liabilities and by other means, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2274

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Domestic Marshall Plan Act" of 1967.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a new dedication of national will and resources must be made to improve the quality of urban life and substantially to eradicate poverty in the United States. The high concentration of unemployed and low-income persons in certain urban and rural areas, the heavy migration of persons of limited skills into urban areas, and the deterioration of housing and of public services in the city slums have resulted in conditions that degrade human dignity, are basic causes of riots and civil disturbance, threaten internal security, and require a reassessment of our national priorities.

The Congress further finds and declares that such conditions must not and need not be allowed to persist in this country and that it is the first domestic priority of the United States substantially to end poverty and to eradicate widespread urban blight and decay within the foreseeable future; and that present programs to achieve these purposes are receiving inadequate public funds and private participation.

The purpose of this Act is to commit additional resources over an extended period of time to programs of job training, employment, economic development, small business, housing, health, income maintenance, community development and individual and family services in order to dedicate this Nation to the elimination of poverty, to the eradication of degrading slums and the establishment of economic security for our citizens.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

SEC. 102. (a) The President, with the advice of the Economic Opportunity Council, is authorized to allocate funds made available under this Act to existing programs, or to new programs adopted after the effective date of the Act, designed:

- (1) provide work training and employment opportunities, including supportive services, for unemployed or low-income persons;
- (2) promote economic development in order to provide job opportunities for unemployed or low-income persons;
- (3) assist in the establishment or strengthening of small business enterprises located in areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons or owned by low-income residents of such areas;
- (4) provide public or private housing for low-income persons;
- (5) promote community development activities in areas of substantial concentration of low-income persons;
- (6) provide income support for low-income individuals or families; and
- (7) provide individual and family services, including health, education and legal services, to low-income persons.

(b) The President is authorized to make grants or loans to public or private agencies or organizations to meet up to 80 percent of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions otherwise required to be made to

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11365

winds, gas inflicts its horror on men, women, children, animals, and crops alike, without regard to status as combatants or noncombatants.

Needless to say, the use of gas warfare invites retaliation in kind. In an age when sophisticated chemical warfare agents are readily available to almost every nation, the possibility of escalating poison gas warfare looms as a terrifying prospect.

To date, our State Department has "condemned" the use of poison gas, and our Government has voiced "concern" in the United Nations. But, Mr. President, that is not enough.

I propose that the United States introduce a resolution in the Security Council of the United Nations calling for establishment of a five-nation Commission to investigate and take action concerning the use of lethal gas in the Middle East.

I believe that such a Commission should be authorized to—

First, determine the source and location of such poison gas in the Middle East, if it exists;

Second, seek assurances from the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc nations that no chemical warfare agents are now being supplied to the Middle East;

Third, demand on-site inspection to insure observance of an embargo on such chemical warfare agents, and make sure that any existing supplies in the area are destroyed; and

Fourth, insist upon reparations for the victims of poison gas attacks.

Some apologists for the administration seem to indicate that our Government may be reluctant to pursue this matter at the present time for fear of being regarded as too "pro-Israel." I see no reason to hesitate merely because our words and actions might antagonize the perpetrators of such criminal acts.

The use of poison gas is not just a crime against a race or a nation; it is a crime against humanity. From the first gas attacks in the trenches in France during World War I, to the murder of 6 million Jews in World War II, the use of poison gas in war has been universally and justifiably condemned. In Yemen, gas warfare has been a crime of Arab against Arab.

As the leader of the free world, the United States should speak out and condemn such atrocities whenever they occur. As a great nation surely we have an obligation to do more than the record reflects to date. The people of the United States have a right to expect no less than the action I propose today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Israel Stocked Up on Gas Masks," written by Col. Ray Cromley, and published in the Detroit, Mich., News, of August 8, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY ISRAEL STOCKED UP ON GAS MASKS
(By Col. Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—There is no longer doubt that the Soviet Union is using the civil war in Yemen as a proving ground for some of its advanced "poison gas" warfare chemicals.

The Russian chemicals were supplied to Egyptian forces which are providing the bulk of the military power of the rebels against the Yemeni royalist government.

The chemical agents have proven highly effective in some of the about five confirmed cases of their use in the desolate country at the southwestern tip of the Arabian peninsula.

This information was obtained from sources which this reporter respects.

The Egyptian use of Russian mankilling chemicals in Yemen, first reported in January, so worried the Israeli armed forces that they made heavy purchases of gas masks at the start of the June fighting with Egypt.

The Saudi Arabian government, which supports the Yemeni royalists, has protested this use of chemical warfare to the secretary-general of the United Nations.

Thus far, Secretary-General U Thant has refused to take any action other than to ask Egypt if its troops were using gas in Yemen. The Cairo government replied that they were not.

It can be stated, however, that the Russian chemicals were supplied to Egypt in the form of thin-walled "bombs" which break open and spread their chemical agents over a wide area.

The Russian-sponsored experiments seem to have been systematic. The Egyptians have not used the chemicals generally in the war but only in certain areas. The attacks have been carefully selected and the techniques and agents used have varied.

Russian-built IL-28s, which have been supplied in quantity to the Egyptian air force, were used to carry the bombs over the royalist targets. There is reason to believe Russian technicians supervised the aerial attacks and the use of the chemical "bombs."

There is no evidence that Russians piloted the planes.

The chemicals being used are of several types. One is a particularly deadly nerve agent (commonly called a nerve gas) which kills quickly. Analysis of fabric found with bomb splinters after one raid showed traces of organic phosphorous compounds which are essential components of "nerve gas."

According to Saudi Arabian medical reports, there are indications that several man-killer chemicals were used in combination in some areas.

In Russian scientific literature, Soviet scientists have reported finding chemical or bacteriological agents used in combination are more effective as killers than when used singly.

Military experts make two points about these gas attacks:

They recall that Russia as well as Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy used the 1936-39 Spanish civil war as a proving ground for weapons and tactics used full-scale in World War II.

The deserts and mountains of Yemen are an ideal location for such experiments since communications inside the country and with the outside world range from nonexistent to primitive.

Few independent observers or journalists have been able to tour the battlefield areas. And quick follow-up investigation of gas attacks is essential since the evidence rapidly fades away.

The Yemen Unit 2 of the International Committee of the Red Cross did report to its regional office on Jan. 14 the gas attack nine days earlier on Kitaf, Yemen.

The unit insisted that its members be provided with gas masks before they could continue their work.

The isolated nature of Yemen explains in part, perhaps, the absence of any world outcry against the use of toxic chemical warfare. In thoroughly reported Vietnam, the occasional use last year of nonlethal riot control gas by U.S. forces set off public demonstra-

tions and government criticism in both the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

The failure to act of UN Secretary-General U Thant—is less easily explained.

Thant took no steps toward sending an investigating team to interview victims of the attacks, to study gas samples or to analyze the remains of dead animals.

There is no sign to date that the UN will ask both sides in the Yemeni fighting for the right to send an investigating team into the area to discourage future attacks or to get the evidence if they occur.

Thant has refused to make at this time even a general statement condemning the use of lethal gas without mentioning Yemen or implicating Egypt or the Soviet Union. In a letter on April 3 to Jamil Baroodi, Saudi Arabian ambassador at the UN, Thant wrote:

"In view of the fact that the secretary-general of the United Nations, in being faithful to the ideals and principles of the United Nations, is necessarily against war and all warlike acts, including the use of lethal gas anywhere by anyone, and since, as you well know, I have repeatedly given expression to this attitude, I do not believe that any useful purpose would be served in acting on this suggestion at the present time."

Baroodi had noted in earlier correspondence that Secretary Thant had not been reluctant to make statements about the war in Vietnam.

CONTRIBUTION OF OEO EMPLOYEES TO THE PREVENTION OF DISTURBANCES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we have been deluged by statements concerning employees of, or participants in, Office of Economic Opportunity programs and their alleged involvement in the civil disturbances which have recently occurred in our Nation. Most of these have been critical of the Office of Economic Opportunity people, blaming them for inciting, contributing to, or at least having an approving attitude about the riots. I am compelled to speak about these allegations.

Recently, in my own State of Rhode Island, there were some disturbances. I am very happy to report that through the effective and wise work of the Providence and State police, the city officials, and the important contribution of persons connected with Progress for Providence, these disorders were held to a minimum.

Progress for Providence, Inc., is the antipoverty agency in the capital city of Rhode Island. This agency is dedicated to the goal of improving living conditions among the poor. Categorically it can be said that one did not find employees of this community action agency walking the streets calling for civil disorders—on the contrary they walked the streets of Providence on the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th of August calling on the people to return to their homes, and to use the vernacular, "cool it."

These poverty workers have been given much of the credit for averting a major outbreak in Providence. After the first night of violence, the Providence Journal carried the following feature, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S 11366

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1967

ANTIPOVERTY WORKERS PLAY AN ACTIVE ROLE

Antipoverty workers were active along with police in South Providence last night and played a major role in trying to prevent a major outbreak.

One incident, in particular, illustrated the role played by the volunteers from Progress for Providence, Inc., the city's antipoverty agency.

At about 9:30 p.m., a group of about 20 youths gathered on Prairie Avenue and began moving toward the Willard Avenue Shopping Center.

Kenneth R. Delves, of 261 Rhodes St., a young assistant director of the agency's South Providence drop-in center on Prairie Avenue, began to follow the group from its starting point at Blackstone Street.

Using a bullhorn, he urged the crowd repeatedly to go to the center. "Listen," he called. "We've got to get back to the drop-in center. That's why it's there."

The gang continued to move toward Comstock Avenue and the shopping plaza. Police remained in the background while Mr. Delves continued his pleading.

When the crowd arrived at Comstock Avenue, it stopped and listened to a sailor who tried to stir them up with inflammatory remarks.

After a few minutes, however, Mr. Delves regained the youths' attention, telling them firmly: "Now come on—I'm on my knees to you guys."

The group heeded Mr. Delves' urging this time and moved to the drop-in center, where most of them remained. It was 15 minutes after Mr. Delves began using his bullhorn. It was one of those turning points that kept the area relatively calm before midnight.

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, Sgt. Manuel Rodrigues of the Providence Police Department is quoted as saying about the poverty workers:

They did a good job; a very good job.

Going further than Sergeant Rodrigues, Mayor Doorley, of Providence, stated:

As far as I'm concerned, there's no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled, "Mayor Praises Work of Police, Poverty Aides," published in the Bulletin on Thursday, August 3, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAYOR PRAISES WORK OF POLICE, POVERTY AIDES

Providence Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. today gave high praise to city police and antipoverty workers for their efforts in trying to head off and then quelling the disturbances in South Providence Monday and Tuesday nights.

The police, the mayor told his press conference, showed "remarkable restraint" in handling the trouble, a factor that undoubtedly prevented even greater violence.

As for the antipoverty workers, the mayor said, they were invaluable in helping to deal with the people of the community and the city does not intend to lose contact with them.

Some of these workers conceivably could have been on the other side during the disturbances in South Providence last summer, the mayor said. Now there is great rapport between them and the police, he added.

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, these teams of poverty workers went without sleep and did everything possible to help officials control the area—from getting peo-

ple home, informing them of the curfew, to helping the police in any way possible. Their work was further described in the Providence Journal of August 3. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"SOUL PATROL" CHECKS: QUIET WAS UNBELIEVABLE

(By C. Fraser Smith)

Team of Progress for Providence workers strolled through a hushed South Providence last night unable to believe the quiet of the section in which most of them grew up.

Organized into teams of four, the "Soul Patrol" moved out of the Willard Avenue Shopping Center shortly after nine. With them was a woman who was not aware of the curfew set by city officials yesterday.

Escorting her home, they walked by the vacant house on Prairie Avenue between Dudley and Blackstone Streets where snipers exchanged fire with police Tuesday night.

Robert Young, 19, of 109 Chester Ave., stopped at the corner house on the north side of the street. He pointed at several bullet holes in the peeling white columns of the house. The night before the street had been filled with the sound of gunfire.

Last night, the entire area was calm. Four young people walked quickly by the white helmeted patrol. They said they would get off the street.

"We are operating on the theory that many people don't know about the curfew," one of the workers said. They turned left on Dudley Street, where firemen had been pelted by bottles and bricks two nights before. For the first 100 yards along the unlighted street they met no one. Barking dogs offered the only break in the stillness.

"I've never seen it this quiet here and I've been living in this area for 12 years," Young said.

"It's almost too quiet," said Felix Donalwa, 27, who is working with the antipoverty agency to develop a rehabilitation program for drug addicts.

From the end of Dudley Street, they turned down West Clifford at about 9:10 p.m., after speaking to people in a car. The driver had pulled away immediately.

At West Clifford and Pearl Street they corralled three youngsters walking down from Broad Street. These three were escorted home also.

At Pearl Street and Prairie Avenue, a spot where a brick smashed the windshield of a police car on the first night of the disturbances, they turned back toward the center. The first police car they had seen passed slowly at 9:45 p.m.

Coming again to the corner of Dudley Street, they turned left and moved toward Rhode Island Hospital.

A younger boy in a white tee shirt passed going swiftly the other way. "The man's going to grab you. It's going to cost you if you get caught," he was told.

Another youth taunted them gently. "Why don't you guys have billy clubs?" he asked.

"Hey, I forgot where my house is," he added. They kept walking as he left the street.

"Any trouble up there yet, Robert," someone yelled from the shadows referring to the center. "Not yet," he answered.

At Dudley and Gay they met the only group who refused to listen. "They knew about the curfew, but they're going to stay out," said Lester Fairweather, 22, a detached worker.

They turned down Gay to Blackstone, turned right and moved past the Flynn School. Half way up the block they stopped to talk to Walter Steele, 58, of 239 Blackstone St.

"I just put my wife on the bus for Dela-

ware," he said. "She's got a heart condition." Mr. Steele, who has a grocery store at the corner of Blackstone and Gay Streets, said he hoped he'd get some sleep.

"I CAN'T FIGHT"

"I haven't been to sleep in two days," he said. He had been up watching the turmoil in the center from his porch, while keeping an eye on his store, he said.

"I can't fight," he said. "I'm 58 years old. I'll fight for my rights, but I can't go up there with those guys."

By then it was 10. A car passed and was stopped by Mr. Fairweather's whistle.

"He was coming in from New Bedford. Didn't know about the curfew," he reported.

Later, while checking out reports of fire bombs on the East Side, the workers said they had hoped the curfew would be extended to that area.

"What I'm worried about," said Lonnie Wilkinson, 22, of 105 Rugby St., "is what will happen at 1 a.m. when all those joints close down." He was afraid that a lot of people would begin to move back into the South Providence with trouble in mind.

FAINTLY IN RED

They drove beyond Cypress Street and stopped in front of a boarded store front with the letters "K.K.K." painted faintly in red. Someone reported trouble on Pleasant Street. They turned around.

As their car came to the intersection of Pleasant and Camp Street, they stopped. The macadam disappeared down a black cavern. There were no street lights.

"Boy, I'm not driving down there," the driver said, "Soul Brother or not."

But they would walk, they decided. "If we can see them we can talk to them," they reasoned.

More than 10 of the 29 Progress for Providence workers were in the Camp Street area by then. They stopped each police car they passed.

"Can we help you?" they asked. The police briefed them each time. There was teamwork.

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, tribute for the job done came from all segments of the community. I think that an editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin of August 4 aptly describes the role played by Progress for Providence during the outbreaks. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ON THE SCENE TO HELP

If antipoverty workers have been instrumental in stirring up trouble in some U.S. cities this summer, as charged, the evidence is quite the contrary in Providence.

When trouble began in South Providence Monday night, workers for Progress for Providence stepped in without hesitation to assist police officers on the scene. Donning helmets, they went among groups of neighborhood youths, pleading for an end to the disturbance and asking them to disperse. One worker used a police bullhorn for three hours, appealing for law and order. Observers said his efforts were effective.

Tuesday night, volunteers from the agency again formed the vanguard of those attempting to restore calm in the troubled area. Police held back as the workers pleaded with the crowd. "Now come on," one volunteer shouted. "I'm on my knees to you guys." Eventually, gunfire forced the police to step in, but the volunteers' efforts had not been wasted.

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. extended this well-earned praise. "As far as I'm concerned," he said, "there's no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you

principal of which shall be repayable in annual installments equal to 2½ per centum of their face value. The principal amount of such bonds issued by the Secretary in any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount by which national defense expenditures for that fiscal year are greater than such expenditures for fiscal 1965. The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 355) shall not apply to any obligations issued by authority of this Act. The authority provided by this Act expires upon the determination by the President that the United States is no longer engaged in hostilities to protect the independence of the Republic of South Vietnam.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, when Israel occupied substantial segments of territory previously held by Jordan, Egypt, and Syria during the war last June, many of us who were familiar with conditions in the Middle East felt a deep foreboding about the problem of the Arab refugees.

Ever since the 1948 war, the refugee problem had been one of the principal contributing factors to instability in the Middle East. During these 19 long years, the Arab States did nothing to resolve the problem and Israel, perhaps, did less than it might have done. But while Israel accepted hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Arab lands, it, at least, made overtures to solve simultaneously the problem of the displaced Arabs. The Arab states, however, responded to none of these overtures and refused to hear of a settlement. In seeking to perpetuate the suffering of the refugees for their own political purposes, I believe the Arab States have borne the burden of responsibility for this misfortune. But we have all paid the price.

Of the 1,300,000 refugees that were under UNWRA care, some 700,000 have now come under Israel jurisdiction. More refugees have since joined them, perhaps hundreds of thousands, victims of the war last June. The number is uncertain, for there has been a consistent pattern of dissembling to inflate the refugee rolls. But Israel, a country of only 2½ million itself, obviously cannot absorb them, whether there are a million or 2 million. Not only are its resources inadequate, but it would be politically absurd for Israel to try to give homes to millions of people who have vowed their eternal enmity to Israel's existence.

In a framework of peace and security Israel may be satisfied to negotiate the return of all or part of the land on which the refugees are currently settled; but since the Arab governments refuse to negotiate a peace, Israel has no choice but to maintain its jurisdiction. Arab leaders recognize that the presence of the refugees suits their purposes by making life difficult for Israel. As for the refugees themselves, the Arab States seem to consider them political pawns to be manipulated as policy demands. They have not treated the refugees as

human beings, so it has been impossible to appeal to a humanitarian impulse within the Arab world.

Within the past few days, Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly clear that the Arab chiefs who look upon the refugees as a source of turmoil have assessed the situation with some accuracy. Arab propagandists are again at work with their messages of hate and destruction. The shock of the first days of war has worn off and the troublemakers again find receptive ears. We have only to take note of the general strike of Arab merchants in Jerusalem last week. By the agreement of all observers, Israel has treated the Jerusalem Arabs well. The strike indicates the kind of behavior one could expect en masse if Israel tried to absorb some millions of Arabs. That behavior might range from civil disobedience, such as we saw in Jerusalem, or guerrilla warfare, such as was conducted for years from the Gaza Strip. The Arab refugees are restless. They are being stirred up. They may soon be contributing actively, as they have in the past, to instability in the Middle East.

Four years ago, I visited Israel and I made an extensive study of the refugees living under United Nations jurisdiction on the Israel frontiers. I warned then that "unless the United States takes the initiative, another decade will find that the Palestine Arab refugees have become even more institutionalized and more difficult to integrate." I made 10 recommendations for the purpose of restoring fluidity to the situation. They were not followed—with a result that we all know—another round of destructive war. I visited Israel again last month and found the situation much worse than before. Millions of dollars had been spent, most of them by the United States, to sustain the refugees. But the years brought no improvement. Conditions have obviously become more threatening and all our money and efforts have been wasted. I repeat now that the United States must act if war is not again to be the fruit of our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is against our national interest to allow the current refugee situation to continue, deteriorating as it does week by week. If the volatile situation in the Middle East explodes once more, the price may be much heavier for all of us. I believe we cannot afford, no matter what the cost, to permit the current refugee problem to rigidify, as it did after the 1948 war. Solutions obviously become more difficult, Mr. Speaker, in ratio to their rigidity.

Unfortunately, my recommendations of 4 years ago will no longer do. Had they been followed then, I believe the refugee problem would have been reduced to manageable limits. But that is spilled milk and we must look elsewhere for an answer.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a dramatic gesture of constructive good will on our part is both mandatory and urgent. That is why I feel the time has come to divest ourselves of some preconceptions. It is the moment for courage and audacity.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the President of the United States to announce

at once his willingness to accept into this country 25,000 refugees of the Arab-Israeli wars.

I have no animosity for the Arab people, nor do my fellow Americans. On the contrary, I believe they can make productive citizens of this country. My study into the refugees 4 years ago indicated that, with relatively little training, many of them could be made into highly skilled workers. I believe that many Arabs would gladly accept the offer to settle in the United States and that the United States would absorb them with almost no difficulty.

It is delusive to expect miracles, Mr. Speaker, but I would hope that such a gesture on our part would produce a chain reaction that might lead to the end of one of the most troublesome aspects of the Middle Eastern morass.

I would look to the other countries of the West to make similar gestures. Most of the Western European countries are still short of labor. Australia and New Zealand welcome immigrants. Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have already offered to accept some Arab refugees. The West has room for more Arab peoples.

The nations of the Communist bloc would, I hope, behave with equivalent magnanimity. Certainly they could do no less than the nations of the West to assist their recent allies.

The various international philanthropic organizations, including the agencies of the United Nations, would, I am sure, cooperate in a major resettlement program.

If I am right in foreseeing events, then surely all the Arab States would be put to tremendous pressure to take in their own brethren, to the limit of their capacity. Certainly, we would help them make the transition, because we would rather spend our money on resettlement than on reconstruction made necessary by another war. How long could the Arab leaders resist welcoming the refugees, if they were being welcomed by peoples throughout the world?

I have no doubt that Israel would also make its contribution, if such a chain of events were underway. Israel is ready to take a proportionate part of the responsibility for the integration of the refugees into society, though obviously it cannot take the full responsibility. Israel has clearly indicated that it would help.

Once the momentum of resettlement begins, we may be able to resolve this problem. The time has come, at least, to make a beginning. We will solve nothing by paralysis. The initiative in this field must lead to negotiations in a variety of other fields where differences remain acute. We must restore fluidity to a situation which is rapidly worsening. Peace in the Middle East requires no less of us, and the cause is worth our effort.

Mr. Speaker, in my report to the Congress in 1963, I stated:

Although I do not regard the solution of the Arab refugee problem as the key issue between Israel and the Arab states, I am convinced that the refugee problem is one of the problems that must be solved if there is to be peace and stability in the Near East.

Today, however, I am of the opinion that unless and until the Arab refugee problem is solved, there can be no peace.

It is tragic, Mr. Speaker, that 4 years have passed since I made that report on the Near East and we have gone through another destructive war, but we are still left with the same dilemmas. The refugee problem is, as I said then, only one of the many differences that exist between Israel and the Arab States. But we Americans learned to our dismay when we went to the brink of war last June that the problems of the Middle East are the world's problems. A new war may be a world war. We cannot afford to sit back waiting for the initiative to come from another quarter. We must not wait for the milk of human kindness to flow from sources which, in our time, have only been dry. We must show by our own good will what the possibilities are for peace. I believe we can set an example for the community of nations. We have the resources and the capacity for moral leadership. I call upon the President to respond positively to my proposal to restore the movement toward permanent peace.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for his compassion and understanding of the problem. Without the settlement of the Arab refugee problem in the Middle East, permanent peace cannot be established in that area of the world. And while I do not speak and cannot speak for what the State of Israel might do, I believe it is commendable that the suggestion is made that the United States take the lead in suggesting and promoting a worldwide program for the resettlement of the Arab refugees.

Of course, the gentleman understands that 25,000 of the 1.3 million refugees is a very small proportion.

I would like to say to the gentleman that on June 13, 1967, I made a statement on the floor of the House rather proposing an extensive program for resettlement of the Arab refugees on the land available in the various territories around the State of Israel, and that it would cost far less to reclaim that arid desert land than it would to conduct an arms race in that area.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for all of his suggestions. They deserve the greatest consideration of our Government.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to say his view and his idea is an excellent one. I might say that of course this is part of this plan. But I feel that if the entire world felt a sense of awareness of this problem, if the entire world did something to break the logjam that has existed for 19 years, that today these Arab refugees who are presently under the control and direction of Israel will be permitted to emigrate from these areas where they are presently located, where previous to June 5 the Arab nations would not permit them to emigrate,

because they used those Arab refugees as a political whip with which to beat Israel over the head.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to say to the gentleman that any plan that will tend to break this long logjam is a plan that will lend to fluidity because if there is an agreement insofar as one item is concerned, then who knows but one may lead to another, this may start a chain of events which will result in peace in the Middle East, which is necessary in order to have peace in the world.

RYAN BILL TO FACILITATE ITALIAN IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, remedy as it did many of the irrational and inequitable policies of our previous laws, the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 contains certain defects—defects which undercut specific policies embodied in that legislation.

Under the present law certain aliens registered in the fifth preference category for immigration into the United States find themselves in a situation which is clearly inconsistent with the policy of equality of treatment and that favoring reunification of families—policies which are fundamental to our new philosophy regarding the treatment of aliens who wish to immigrate to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as I will explain in greater detail, the effect of the immigration law is to discriminate against Italian brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens compared to brothers and sisters of other nationalities applying for permanent immigration visas.

The existing situation is such that an Italian brother and sister as well as his spouse and children, on behalf of whom a petition for immigration under the fifth preference category is filed today, will wait at the minimum 10 years before he will receive a visa. A more realistic estimate is that he will wait 15 to 20 years.

In comparison, one from any of the other 33 nations for which the fifth preference is oversubscribed, for whom a similar petition is filed, will probably be required to wait, in most cases, no longer than 1 or 2 years before receiving an immigration visa.

Conversely, an Italian eligible for fifth preference status must have filed over 12 years ago in order to receive an immigration visa. An alien, holding fifth preference status, from any of the other 33 nations for which that category is oversubscribed, must have filed only 13 months ago in order to receive a similar visa.

The Visa Office of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department informs me that as of the end of 1966 there were nearly 100,000 Italians who had been approved for fifth preference status.

Under the current law the Italian quota is 5,666 per year; but section 201

(c) and (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965—8 U.S.C. 1151 (c) and (d)—provides that quota numbers, unused in a preceding fiscal year are to be put in an immigration pool for use during the next fiscal year. Immigrants unable to obtain an immigration visa under the regular allotment for a specific preference category can obtain a visa from this pool during a subsequent fiscal year in accordance to their preference status and the date their petition was filed with the Attorney General—section 203(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965—8 U.S.C. 1153(c).

Although the 1965 act abolishes the discriminatory national origin quota system, it does place a maximum limit of 170,000 on the number of permanent immigrants permitted to come into the United States each year from non-Western Hemisphere countries. Section 201(a)—8 U.S.C. 1151(a). Furthermore, section 202(a)—8 U.S.C. 1152(a)—restricts the number of permanent immigrants from any one country to 20,000 per year. Special immigrants defined by section 101(a) (27)—8 U.S.C. 1101(a) (27)—and immediate relatives of U.S. citizens—defined in section 201(b)—8 U.S.C. 1115(b)—as children, spouses and parents of a citizen of the United States—are not subject to the numerical limitations.

Under section 203(a)(5)—8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(5)—24 percent of the 170,000 annual maximum are permitted to immigrate annually under the fifth preference classification. That is, 40,800 brothers and sisters, and their spouses and children, of U.S. citizens are permitted to come into the United States each year in the order in which their petition has been filed with the Attorney General—section 204(a)—8 U.S.C. 1154(a); section 203(c)—8 U.S.C. 1153(c).

I point out that the 40,800 limit includes not only brothers and sisters of United Citizens, but a spouse or child—unmarried person under 21 years of age—who is not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa, or to conditional entry, under another preference category—section 203(a)(9)—8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(9).

Thus, for example, of the 3,538 permanent immigrant visas issued to fifth preference Italians between December 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, 1,269 were for brothers or sisters of a U.S. citizen; 726 were for spouses of those brothers and sisters; and 1,543 were for children of those brothers and sisters—Annual Report of the Visa Office, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, U.S. Department of State, 1966, page 45.

Theoretically, any visas not required for the first four preference categories can be used by fifth preference applicants.

Since the Visa Office has not, as yet, compiled figures regarding permanent visas issued for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, my projections are based upon the number of permanent visas issued between the effective date of the 1965 act, December 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966. During that period the number of permanent visas issued to Italians by preference category were as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 10, 1967

reason to be proud of him yet because he had not yet done his job," Mr. Sobsey recalled. The young soldier enlisted in the Army two days after his graduation from Albert Einstein High School, Kensington, Md., in June, 1966.

BORN ON WEST COAST

He was born in Los Angeles and grew up in Las Vegas, Nev. The family moved to Maryland in 1959, after the election of Senator Cannon (D., Nev.), for whom Mr. Sobsey is executive secretary.

Pfc. Brunson is survived by his stepfather; his mother, Mrs. Mary Alice Sobsey; his grandmother, Mrs. Tina Truman; a sister, Barbre Alice Brunson; and two brothers, Stephen M. Sobsey and Robert L. Sobsey, all of Garrett Park.

A Confused Call for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of publicity, most of it unfavorable, focused on the House of Representatives rejection of the resolution to consider the Rat Extermination Act of 1967.

My vote against the resolution was based on the conviction that rat eradication can best be handled at the local level, and that the existing Federal programs to provide financial assistance to fight rats do not require further proliferation.

No one, Mr. Speaker, ever denied that rats pose a serious problem to the health and economy of our Nation. Yet, there was a great hue and cry to the effect that Congress is impervious to the welfare of small children—that it spends millions to protect cows but spends nothing to protect babies.

Mr. Speaker, as the New Bedford Standard Times pointed out in an editorial of August 3, such claims are totally unjustified. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues what I consider to be a significant contribution to the rational consideration of the issue in its proper perspective. As the editorial so aptly points out, "sentiment has obscured reason" in the rat issue.

A CONFUSED CALL FOR ACTION

President Johnson's continuing effort to make the proposed federal rat control program a symbol of what Congress could do for urban harmony and peace is most regrettable.

The President is unfairly making a scapegoat of the House, which rejected the program. He is furnishing ammunition to riot inciters who need do no more than quote the President. And, unfortunately, the issue has, in reality, little or nothing to do with civil rights or civil disorder.

The administration's idea is to spend \$40 million for eradicating rats, over a three-year period, with cities doubling U.S. grants the third year but contributing nothing up to then.

It is beyond contention that the rat population is substantial, that each year an undetermined number of children and adults are bitten, and that material damage from the rodents is extensive.

But the basis of the House majority's opposition was that the problem is one for the cities. And it has been so considered. It is noteworthy that, on the authority of Dr. Allan W. Donaldson, associate director of the U.S. Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, the city that has been most successful is none other than Detroit, where rat bites were reduced from 123 in 1951 to 17 in 1965.

In this light, then, it is disturbing to review what the President has said within the past few days:

"If we can spend millions of dollars to protect cows from screw worms, why can't we spend a little more money to protect our children from rats?"

And, speaking to the nation after the Detroit madness, "A government that has spent millions to protect baby calves can surely afford the same concern for baby boys and girls."

Sentiment has obscured reason in this approach. Contagious disease among animals or humans, whether hookworm, hepatitis or cancer, is properly a challenge to the federal government. But there is no epidemic threat in this country from rats, says Dr. Donaldson.

Rats would not be a threat without accumulations of garbage and filth and property neglect, for which lazy or indifferent people and city governments share responsibility. It is at that level that Mr. Johnson should call for action, and not confuse the need for cleanliness with the causes of civil lawlessness.

You'll Pay for the Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the call by President Johnson for an income tax increase has not been greeted with enthusiasm in Iowa.

On Friday, August 4, an editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat reflected the thinking of many Iowans.

It called for reduced domestic spending and elimination of waste. The editorial follows:

YOU'LL PAY FOR THE WASTE

President Johnson linked a call for a 10 per cent surcharge on income tax Thursday with an announcement that American troop strength in Vietnam will be increased by 45,000 to 50,000.

The device here is so transparent it must be plain to all. He would have it appear the war is the reason for measures to avert a budget deficit which could surpass \$28 billion.

It is one of the compelling reasons, of course. This nation is pouring \$66 million a day into that effort.

The United States could finance a tremendously expensive war without such a surtax, though, if it were not for the financial waste which Mr. Johnson and the Congress permit to continue in the Federal government.

Pleas for greater fiscal responsibility are ignored.

Surveys reveal the cost of national defense has not risen as rapidly as that for non-defense purposes. Just how many hundred thousand employees have been added to the Federal payroll during the Johnson Administration cannot be stated accurately except when a computation is run on any given date because it has been a continually on-

ward and upward process. One critic has suggested it probably "exceeds the population of Texas."

No one should question paying his share when the nation is at war. It is little enough by comparison with the sacrifices of men taken far from home to endure hardship, and possibly injury or death.

Everyone has a right, though, to demand an end to concurrent waste.

And President Johnson has no right to confuse one with the other in trying to justify a 10 per cent addition to your tax bill.

Nerve Gas: A First for Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nasser's inhumanity to his fellow man, and to his brother Arab no less, was once again demonstrated by his use of lethal nerve gas against the Yemenite population.

The International Red Cross has confirmed the use of this gas and has reported that women, children, and livestock, as well as Yemenite troops, have fallen victim to Nasser's brutality.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Ralph McGill, for the August 3, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star. The article concerns Nasser's atrocious acts and follows:

NERVE GAS: A FIRST FOR NASSER

In Yemen President Nasser's love and compassion for his brother Arab is revealed by his army's use of lethal gas on villages and troops. Women, children, cattle and other livestock are among the victims.

The International Red Cross has confirmed the use of these gases. The United Nations has a report. The gas is being dropped in bombs. It is a mixture of phosgene and nerve gas. Phosgene was the gas which attained notoriety and condemnation in the First World War. The Germans initiated use of it against French and Canadian troops on the Ypres front, on April 22, 1915.

Nerve gas has been used in Yemen for the first time in the history of warfare. It is, as used in Yemen, mixed with phosgene. Nerve gas, either in liquid or spray form, is a killer. There is an injection of atropine which, if taken immediately after exposure will save the victim's life.

Adults, however, will find no comfort in news of the specific. Persons around 40 years old and above are not helped by the injection.

The U.A.R. reportedly had stockpiles of the gas bombs on the Sinai desert. There also are persisting stories that Israeli troops captured some of the bombs and at a moment regarded as propitious for the best propaganda and diplomatic results will release them for public view. This story of the capture of such gas bombs is, as aforesaid, not confirmed.

In Yemen it is confirmed. The International Red Cross has even exhumed some bodies. Samples of tissue and blood have been laboratory tested and evidence found of phosgene and nerve gas. There also have been signs of the occasional use of mustard gas.

Nasser has had 40,000 troops in Yemen for about two years. (The total was reduced to approximately 25,000 before the attack on Israel.) His enemies are the "royalists." They are, for the most part, tribesmen who have

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 4071

policy the Executive is imposing upon our nation.

Nevertheless, I am happy to announce that bridges are being built between the U.S. and Rhodesia. But this time, they are being built from the other end. The Rhodesians today consider that they have won the battle of the sanctions. Not every sector of their economy is up to par, but in the main the balance of trade favors Rhodesia. Despite the UN sanctions, Rhodesia is trading with the world.

Meanwhile, Rhodesian chromite is on the banned list. So to make good on our policy of knifing our friends, the Administration has had to allow U.S. dollars to go abroad to the Soviet Union to import Communist chromite.

So bridges are being built to Rhodesia, and they are being built from both sides. The wonderful turnout at this dinner this evening is proof that many Americans are willing to indulge in "peaceful-coexistence" with Rhodesia. It shows that there may be some benefit in cultural exchanges after all. It may even be that by programs such as this we may cause Rhodesia to "mellow" and cease being the threat to world peace that Mr. Ambassador Goldberg keeps complaining about.

Rhodesia's problem. If we may try to guess at the strange workings of the minds of our policymakers, seems to be that Rhodesians are still too anti-Communist. Rhodesia wants the West to win. The American policy is No-win. All around the world, we have been anti-anti-Communist. Our policy of Communist containment has been less than successful. We have been far more successful at containing and demoralizing the anti-Communists.

I have one more item to report as evidence of Rhodesian spirit. On May 7, the Rhodesian Minister of Internal Affairs, Mr. William Harper, spoke to the Rhodesian Reserve Officers Association in Bulwayo.

Mr. Harper expressed his personal view that the Rhodesian Government would be willing to allow Rhodesians to volunteer to help the American effort in Vietnam. Telegram confirms definite offer of Rhodesia to help. Now, the men of the Rhodesian army and reserves are superior trained fighters. They have had experience with Communist guerrillas fighting hand to hand in Malaysia. More than that, they have the will to win. If the offer of the Rhodesian government is accepted by the U.S. and South Vietnam, it is believed that as many as 5,000 crack troops and officers would immediately make themselves available to go to Vietnam. There is nothing that Rhodesians would like better than to help the West win the war against world Communism.

I think that Rhodesia has solved many of its problems. Its independence is no more a matter of dispute by sensible observers. They are willing to open up lines of communication with Britain on any matter that will not jeopardize their independence. They would like to renew their relationship with Britain as trading partners, to the mutual advantage of both. They are hoping that the U.S. will return to a position that at least approaches neutrality, if not accepting the willing hand of friendship offered.

The question now stands with the United States: Do we want victory over world Communism? Are we so anxious to be friends with the Communists that we want to squelch a valuable friend from the Western tradition? Will the U.S. accept the Rhodesian volunteers? If we accept the Rhodesian volunteers, we should only do it if we have the will to win, as the Rhodesians have the will to win. Two years ago when the Rhodesians declared independence, everybody said that they couldn't win. They didn't reckon with the spirit of courage, patriotism, loyalty, and devotion that has typically animated Western man. The Rhodesians have it. That's why they are winning. That's why they want to help the West

win in Vietnam. The United States has the power, the capability, the history to win. We must now demonstrate that we have the will to win, not only in Vietnam, but everywhere that Communism presents its challenge of world conquest. Ladies and Gentlemen, when we do, Rhodesia will be standing proudly by our side.

A Tribute to Astronauts Grissom, White, and Chaffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a particularly impressive poem, dedicated to the memory of the three valiant astronauts who so tragically lost their lives early this year. It was written by John-Allen Seybold and Donald A. Seybold, who have taken a great interest in these three astronauts, as a tribute to the special place these men have earned in our history.

As Representative from the Fifth District of Florida, which includes the Kennedy Space Center, I felt particularly close to Astronauts Grissom, White, and Chaffee. This poem vividly illustrates the contribution that these great men made to our space program, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

A PLACE TO STAND

(By John-Allen Seybold and Donald A. Seybold)

For an instant—
The valiant young have shown their courage.
They have demonstrated a spirit, a force,
Determined that the task shall be done—
A million moments of effort
May fail,
A million attempts
Without gains—
Amid throes,
Laments and refrains—
Yet, in another instant
Courage will prevail,
That one brilliant moment
When the valiant shall demand—
When in their finest hour,
They will affirm
I have a place to stand,
And I shall move the world.
This,—an adage
As ancient as the world itself
And still
As young and as grand—
That is all they have asked,
These valiant three.
Give me a place,
Let me contribute to the knowledge vast—
To contribute with honor
Toward the conquest in space
Of that waterless sea—
They have embraced their courage
Embraced too, their love.

Then these three,
These very valiant three of late
Have only asked the same,
Give us a place to stand
Within the frame
Of God's own estate—
Whereupon,—they stood
To be well counted
As they shall be—evermore—
Of these three,
These valiant who endeavored,
One has often said, to us,

It is well worth the risk
In that sea
If life is lost,—yet, never,
Never in vain—
And said another
I have been there
I have walked in God's own yard,
And nothing
Has made me more aware
That I had found a place to stand
Where men and trouble
Are of small regard—
And the third of these valiant men so tall
Said,—I wish to move the world
Still, I must do it well
Or not at all.

That selfish infinite sea, their goal
Ever reaching—but conquerable
Yet, cruel and merciless,
A vacuumed swell
So determined to exact its toll—
But that seeming endless task
Has only spelled their courage for a time.
It has not abated their valor,
Not one whit.
Let them gain a running start
In the spirit of their souls
And they are joined
By an entourage
Of young men who demand with grit—
Give to us that place to stand!
Give to us the valiant goals!
For only then, I stand to courage
With pride and dignity—
And they each say, together—
Let not the hours that wound
Retard your faith,
But renew each moment soon,
That others,—those behind us
The many valiant young shall make
That move to valor
So that our souls may hear them say,
Give me a place to stand
Give me a heaven near
I strive to move the world
I yearn to hold God's hand.

Montgomery GI Dies in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Lance D. Brunson, a young paratrooper from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MONTGOMERY GI DIES IN VIETNAM—PFC. BRUNSON SERVED WITH 101ST AIRBORNE

GARRETT PARK, Md., Aug. 9.—Pfc. Lance D. Brunson, a Montgomery county paratrooper, was killed Sunday in Vietnam, exactly three weeks after he left the United States, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Pfc. Brunson died of multiple wounds received on a combat mission, according to his stepfather, Chester B. Sobsey, of 10705 Montrose avenue, Garrett Park.

Pfc. Brunson, 20, was stationed in a weapons platoon with the 101st Airborne Division, the "Screaming Eagles." He left the United States for Vietnam July 16.

TRIPLE VOLUNTEER

Pfc. Brunson was a volunteer all the way. Mr. Sobsey said last night—he volunteered for the Army, for the paratroopers and for Vietnam.

"In his last letter he said there was no

remained loyal to their king, who was displaced by a Nasser-supported coup. Despite the fact they are relatively untrained and possess few weapons, they have managed to stand off the Egyptian troops.

Now, however, they are probably near defeat. The first use of phosgene gas against them was in 1966.

In January 1967, the International Red Cross reported another gas attack, largely against villagers. This was nerve gas, the first use of it in history. Over 200 villagers, including women and children, and livestock were killed.

In May, shortly before mobilization against Israel, there was another attack.

Since that war ended, Nasser has stepped up use of gas. On July 4, 5 and 10, nerve gas was dumped on the Yemen villagers and on areas where the stubborn army was holding out. There understandably is growing panic and fear among the people who have for so long opposed Nasser's army.

There has been loud outcry because of the general use of napalm in recent warfare, including that in Vietnam. There was protest, even, against the use of defoliation sprays to kill leaves in jungle areas of heavy troops and arms concentration.

But Nasser's brutal use of lethal gas against civilians and troops—all fellow Arabs—has gone unprotested in and out of the United Nations. The silence is outrageous.

Just why the Russians, who are now the most influential power with Nasser, do not use their connection to halt use of gas also is a question. It does not redound to Soviet credit to be rebuilding Nasser's armed strength and not demanding he cease the ugly and barbaric use of gas in Yemen.

Key Job To Fill at State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that many Members of Congress learn that Wayne Fredericks, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, is leaving Government service. Mr. Fredericks is a man of unusual qualifications and his absence will be felt in the State Department and here in Washington. I wish to insert an editorial from today's New York Times paying tribute to Wayne Fredericks.

The editorial is as follows:

KEY JOB TO FILL AT STATE

A Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs does not rank high in the State Department bureaucracy, but J. Wayne Fredericks transformed that post into a key instrument of two-way education. He did much to educate leaders of the new Africa about America, but his greater contribution may have been the education of Americans about Africa's problems and prospects.

Mr. Fredericks was a tireless advocate of an active and distinctive American policy for a continent usually low on Washington's priority list. He thus helped overcome that "tremendous institutional inertial force" at State of which Adlai Stevenson warned President-elect Kennedy in 1960. He aroused an enduring interest in Africa on the part of intelligent young members of the Congress and many others in the community at large.

This dedicated man could carry on such a free-wheeling, many-faceted operation in

part because he was not a career diplomat, beholden to the Foreign Service establishment. With his departure from Government, President Johnson and Secretary Rusk would be well advised to conclude that they can best fill the job by going outside the Foreign Service, as President Kennedy did when he appointed Mr. Fredericks in 1961.

Providing an Improved Promotion System for Medical and Dental Officers of the Armed Forces

SPEECH OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10242 which would provide for an improved promotion system for medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces. This legislation was a long time coming and is urgently needed, in my considered opinion.

By improving the promotional system the poor retention rate of physicians and dentists in the armed services will be improved. This, in turn, will provide for more experienced medical personnel, the end result being improved quality in medical care to our service men and women.

Unsatisfactory promotion opportunity has long been an important factor in our poor retention rate in the medical and dental officer corps. Physicians and dentists are highly trained and scarce commodities of personnel who have never had equal promotion opportunity in the armed services. They have always had to compete with other officers in the line for promotion when a vacancy occurred. This new legislation will eliminate the wasteful and unnecessary competition with line officers, and will create new promotional opportunities in the Medical and Dental Corps, especially for field grades.

The legislation would also grant much needed relief of the presently severe restriction in the number of authorized general or flag officer positions. As we well know, under existing regulations, we cannot expect to retain our senior colonels beyond the 20-year point unless there is a reasonable opportunity for further promotion.

I have introduced similar legislation which would assist in the elimination of this problem throughout the entire armed services which is entitled "selected extended tenure program." Coupled with this is the fact that the military is unable at present, to promote their experienced clinical specialists to general officer grade without removing them from their clinical position. What is required is authorized flag and general officer positions in our teaching hospitals and larger medical centers, so as to provide the incentive for highly qualified physicians to remain in the military service. The remaining step is to possibly increase and certainly compress specialty professional and proficiency pay.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this legislation not only provides new career incentive through promotion and retention, but it would substantially enhance the prestige of highly qualified physicians and dentists in the armed services.

Parceling Out the Riot Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that there is a need for a reappraisal of the problems facing the cities of America. However, rather than a serious reappraisal, what we are experiencing is a frantic effort to place the blame for these tragic events on the President, Congress, Governors, mayors, and others.

I would commend to my colleagues a column written by Frank Getlein, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Star. It illustrates the futility of attempting to indict any one person or institution for riots and other ills of our society. The column follows:

PARCELING OUT THE RIOT BLAME (By Frank Getlein)

The amazing things about the recent riots in our cities is how perfectly they bore out the direst forebodings of practically everyone. It isn't just that they didn't take anyone by surprise. Nothing takes anyone by surprise anymore. But beyond that, after the events—and even during them—the riots turned out to be the predictable result of what everyone on all sides of every question has been arguing all the time.

Take the gunnats, pro and con, who are the easiest to identify with a simple, strong position. From the point of view of the anti-gunnats, if only Congress had passed a firearms control law after the assassination of President Kennedy, as the anti-gunnats urged at the time, the riots would never have taken place, since the only guns around would be in the hands of the police, a likely story.

The pro-gunnats, by contrast, find that the riots prove their point that the worst thing Congress could do would be to pass a gun control law. When riots erupt, the law-abiding citizen is well-advised to have a shooting iron handy to protect his loved ones and his property. If shopowners and pedestrians had only had more guns of their own, the riots wouldn't have happened, another likely story.

Moving from the surface froth to the surges of the deep, we find the same interesting manifestation of simultaneous arrival at the same place from opposite starting points by moving in opposite directions.

One school holds that riots are the direct result of congressional inaction on administration proposals for expanding the poverty program. "If Sarge were only here," the thought goes, "these things wouldn't have happened." This seems to suppose that snipers and swipers are all subscribers to the Congressional Record and hit the streets whenever their favorite magazine reports bad news for ole Sarge. Possible, of course. There have been stranger literary tastes than the Record, although it's hard to think of one offhand.

On the other side of that particular street,

August 10, 1967

A4074

the view is that the riots are obviously caused by a Supreme Court gone soft on the rights of criminals. Civil rights are civil riots. Tell potential rioters in advance that police will not be allowed to listen to their confessions, that they have to be provided with lawyers, that if convicted they can be released at once for any of a dozen constitutional reasons, and naturally they'll riot. Wouldn't you?

One of the most ingenious twists in the argument is the one that blames the riots on President Johnson for having aroused expectations he was totally unable to fulfill and not even especially interested in fulfilling. The implication here is that as long as the wretched and oppressed don't expect anything they don't give any trouble, so let's not disturb their despair. In the historical context of presidential promises, what is significant is that apparently for the first time in our political history a segment of the citizenry actually believed what a president said he would do for them and ran rioting when he didn't do it. Well, it's true that many Negroes have been deprived of a decent education, but surely they are not so totally deprived as to take a politician's word for his bond.

Equally comforting to those who hold it is the outside agitator theory of riots. The approach here is that young unemployed Negroes in any given community are perfectly happy, all the time singing and doing the cake-walk, until those rascally outsiders come inside from the cold and make things hot.

A particularly striking instance of the identity of opposites in riot theory is found in the role of the police. In Detroit, the police are blamed for not moving in immediately with hard hats and hard noses and no nonsense. If only firm action had been taken from the first, it is righteously pointed out, nothing at all would have happened. On the other hand, the police in Milwaukee did move swiftly to control the situation and what are they, for their pains? Honky-fascists, that's what; guilty of police brutality and premature tough-mindedness. It's not just that the police can't win; they can't even hope to stay even. No matter what they do, no matter whether a riot takes place or not, no matter whether people are killed or people are saved, the police are always wrong.

And so, for that matter, is everyone else. From some point of view or other, everyone—President, Congress, poverty workers, black power shouters, mayors, governors, National Guard, police, white men, black men, beggermen, thieves—everyone is responsible for the riots.

That's the beauty of it. What everyone is responsible for, nobody has to do anything about except sort out the blame onto all those other people. And that is what, in Congress, in committee, in state house and White House, in your house and my house, we are all engaged in doing.

Negro Fighter Pilot Hits Carmichael, Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the history of the United States is replete with the words and deeds of men who loved their country. The words of these patriots have been pertinent to their times, and I know of no recent public utterance more apt and moving than

that of Col. Daniel James, Jr., an Air Force fighter pilot stationed in Vietnam, as quoted by William Tuohy, writing in the Los Angeles Times of August 9, and carried in the Washington Post August 10:

If something is wrong with my country right now, then I'm willing to hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right.

So said Colonel James.

Mr. Speaker, those words should be engraved on every American's heart. How much more powerful are the words of this distinguished American who is serving his country so well than the mouthings of black power advocate Stokely Carmichael who would tear this country apart, rather than build her up.

Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with our country right now, thanks, in part, to the Carmichaels and the Rap Browns. So let us join with Colonel James—and not only “hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right”—but help her to “get right.”

Mr. Tuohy's article on Colonel James follows. I commend it to all who love our country.

NEGRO FIGHTER PILOT HITS CARMICHAEL, BLACK POWER (By William Tuohy)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, AUGUST 9.—“Stokely Carmichael is a big-mouth who is making a profession out of being a Negro, and he's got no damn business speaking for me,” said the tall, impressive-looking Negro pilot. “This Black Power garbage is for the birds.”

Col. Daniel James Jr., 47, carries his 230 pounds on a 6-foot, 4-inch frame covered by a distinctive black flying suit with silver cologne's eagles on the shoulders. There are command pilot's wings on his breast just above the name: “Chapple James.”

Chapple James, the biggest fighter pilot in the Air Force, has become something of a legend in the air war in Vietnam. He flies an F-4 Phantom fighter and is vice wing commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing based in Thailand. The commander is James's closest friend, Col. Robin Olds, the Air Force's top ace.

In Danang on a short visit, Col. James said in an interview, “These riots are the worst thing that could happen to the Negroes' cause. This could set the civil rights movement back 100 years. A lot of the fence-sitters are jumping off on the wrong side now.”

Col. James emphasized that he did not speak for the white establishment.

“We're fighting to get laws passed to protect civil rights,” James pointed out. “You've got to obey laws. You can't have a double standard.”

James is especially critical of Stokely Carmichael, the former head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

“I resent Stokely's setting himself up as spokesman for Negroes,” he said. “This S.O.B. is leading too many kids astray. And when he advises Negro servicemen to come back and fight at home—that's sheer stupidity.”

In case anyone should question his own credentials in the civil rights movement, James added, “Hell, I was in the original sit-in back in 1943.”

He and nearly 100 other Negro Army Air Corps cadets refused to accept segregation at Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan. They were all arrested and threatened with court-martial, but they held their ground and the charges later were dropped.

“What I really don't buy is that back-to-Africa stuff,” James concluded. “I'm not an

African immigrant. I'm an American with several generations behind me in my country.

“If something is wrong with my country right now, then I'm willing to hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right.”

Born in Pensacola, Fla., and a graduate of Tuskegee Institute, James now lives in Tucson, Ariz. He has two sons, one in Air Force ROTC at the University of Arizona, and a daughter who was formerly an airline stewardess.

A Push For ETV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation establishing a private, nonprofit corporation to improve noncommercial, educational radio and television, I am pleased that support for public television is growing across the Nation.

As the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette noted in an editorial on July 1, National and State committees are being formed “to develop a public interest in educational television, chiefly among practitioners of the arts and civic leaders.”

In my own home state of Pennsylvania, a committee on public television has begun a study of the possibility of a statewide public television network and a public television corporation.

The proposals by the Pennsylvania committee closely parallel the provisions of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 I have sponsored. Both recognize the importance of strong interconnections between local stations and the necessity of program and operational support from a private, nonprofit corporation.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial asserts that “public television must fight for its independence and establish itself as a rival to commercial television.” The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will help it do just that. In the hope that my colleagues will support this worthwhile legislation, I insert the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial at this point in the Record, and commend its strong arguments for public television to their attention:

A PUSH FOR ETV

Creation of national and state committees for public television is good news for those who are fed up with the insipid fare provided by the commercial networks.

The federal committee, under the chairmanship of Thomas P. F. Hoving, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, will seek to develop a public interest in educational television, chiefly among practitioners of the arts and civic leaders.

In Pennsylvania, the Governor's Committee on Public Television, cochaired by Albert J. Nesbitt, of Philadelphia, and Joseph D. Hughes, of Pittsburgh, met this week to begin a study of the creation of a statewide public television network as soon as possible and to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing a corporation for public television. The committee will complete its work before the end of this year and hopefully the seven ETV stations pres-